Baconiana.

VOL. X.—*New Series.* JULY, 1902. No. 39.

ABRIDGED REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL AND MEMBERS OF THE BACON SOCIETY, 22, ALBEMARLE STREET, MAY 12, 1902.

A GENERAL MEETING of the Council and Members of the Bacon Society was held on May 12th, at the Rooms of the Asiatic Society, 22, Albemarle Street, Piccadilly. The meeting was well attended. General Sir Percy R. B. Feilding, Bart. (President of the Society), was in the Chair.

After some preliminary words from the President alluding to the controversy about Mrs. Gallup's book, he called upon Mr. Fearon (Vice-President) to read some notes which he had prepared on the subject.

Mr. Fearon said that before commencing the business of the evening (namely, the appointing of officers of the Society for the ensuing year), it would be well that a few words should be said on matters connected with the Society's subjects and interests. He commented upon the fact that the Society, in spite of opposition and difficulties, had been steadily making its way. Many good, scholarlike, and convincing books continued to be published, and now formed a considerable literature (lists of these being from time to time printed in BACONIANA). Mr. Fearon then launched into the much-vexed question of the Cipher, describing the "strong divergence of opinion" immediately produced by Mrs. Gallup's book, and the strange and sensational story which it reveals. He spoke of the attempts made by himself and others to decipher, and their failure even to distinguish the necessary two founts of *Italic* type. Nevertheless, Mr. Fearon admitted "There was no sign of any desire (on Mrs. Gallup's part) to keep back anything, on the contrary she did her best to satisfy us, but failed." Mr. Fearon and those who share his views seemed to think it incumbent upon Mrs. Gallup to produce "10 or 12 alphabets for 10 or 12 of the principal books worked upon by her," in order that these

should be lithographed, and distributed amongst those who wished to be convinced. Mrs. Gallup's sight, however, having failed her, she left England, and the alphabets, which Mr. Fearon considered to be promised, never came. The articles written to English magazines by Mrs. Gallup did not, in Mr. Fearon's opinion, carry the matter any further. The book was "pounced upon by the critics, who evidently had not studied it; but the word had evidently gone forth that it was to be smashed. This was a pity, as the question of the existence of the Cipher should be settled definitely."

The speaker then alluded briefly to Mr. Mallock's advocacy of the Cipher (in an article published in the *Nineteenth Century*). He described the Council as "reconciled to the policy of abiding events" by hearing that Mr. Mallock was causing enlarged photographs to be made of some pages on which Mrs. Gallup had worked, and which might facilitate research. The Council did not think it worth while to discuss the statements and stories supposed to have been evolved by the cipher, until they were certain that the evolution had taken place, and that what was stated to be told, was actually told.

On the conclusion of his paper the Vice-President read the list of the present officers of the Society, and of the Members whose names had been submitted as willing to serve on the Council. The following were elected, and now form the Council of the Bacon Society :—

President:

GENERAL SIR PERCY R. B. FEILDING, BART.

Vice-President:

MR. FEARON.

Re-elected on the Council:

MR. G. COX BOMPAS. MR. E. T. MILLER.
MR. HENRY POTT.

Newly Elected:

MR. HAROLD BAYLEY. MR. W. T. SMEDLEY.
MR. FLEMING FULCHER. MR. A. P. SINNETT.
MR. C. E. NEWBON. MR. R. M. THEOBALD.

MR. HENRY POTT was re-elected *Treasurer* to the end of the year.

MR. A. T. JONES was appointed Assistant Secretary and Clerk for the ensuing year.

A brisk debate then followed. Mr. Sinnett, being invited to speak, expressed his own opinions about the Cipher question. Personally he was disposed to believe in it, not because he had endeavoured to check or verify it, but because he found that the probability of its being correct was exceedingly strong. The wonderful narrative of Francis "Bacon's" parentage seemed to absorb all attention, but that was not nearly all that Mrs. Gallup's book contained; she could not have made that translation from Homer. He thought it a pity that in the present state of knowledge, such great stress should be laid upon the Cipher subject by its opponents, as virtually to make men forget or ignore other momentous questions. All possible efforts should be made to bring the Bacon Society and the mass of information which it has accumulated, prominently before the public. In spite of press opposition, he believed that there were now thousands of educated people in England in sympathy with the Baconians. He looked forward to the time when Baconians would hold their meetings in the largest halls of London. Whether the Cipher were true or false (and it seemed *impossible* to believe it false), this Cipher had created an amount of feeling never felt before, and if the Society failed to take advantage of the present opportunity, it would be better to dissolve it than to impede the work of propaganda.

Sir Percy Feilding in thanking Mr. Sinnett for the suggestions made in his speech, said that there seemed to be many present who believed in the Cipher, and he called upon any one present who understood the subject, to speak upon it.

Mr. Parker Woodward said that although he had not worked at the Biliteral Cipher, yet he had followed the story, and had come across many corroborative statements which should be probed into. He thought it unnecessary in the present condition of things for any one to be forced to pledge his opinions upon matters evidently not as yet clearly understood, and which must require much study and time before they could be fairly sifted and decided upon. He did not wish to enter into controversy or acrimonious discussion, but he thought it unfair, as well as unwise, for the Society to refuse to meet and patiently examine into facts or supposed discoveries which might be brought before them. He disapproved of the Resolution, passed by some of the Council in December, 1901, which committed the Society, as a whole, to hostile opinions shared only by a minority. He did not feel that Mrs. Gallup had been handled so kindly as she deserved, and he con-

sidered that the spirit in which she had met her critics was admirable.

Mr. Woodward concluded by saying that as the Press combined in trying to suppress Baconism, the Society should exert itself to make its whereabouts, as well as its publications and tenets, better known. (This speech was much approved.)

Mr. Newbon wished to corroborate the suggestion that the Society should now go boldly before the public. He hoped that the Society would consider the subject with a logical mind, and convince themselves as men capable of exercising judgment.

Mr. Harold Bayley next read some interesting notes from the point of view of an expert, on the different types "which stared him plainly in the face" in the Baconian type. The errors* which he had himself discovered in this Baconian type were so many, that it could not be thought surprising if Mrs. Gallup were sometimes mistaken. He was acquainted with Mrs. Gallup; he believed her to be on the whole correct; she always answered in a perfectly straightforward manner the questions which he put to her on these matters.

Mr. Smedley did not consider the Cipher subject of vital importance. He earnestly exhorted the Society to bestir itself, and to come prominently before the public. Ample funds, he was sure, would be forthcoming if only the Council and Society would very considerably wake up and regard its work in a more serious manner. It is a solemn duty that the life and true character of "Bacon," Lord Verulam —Viscount St. Alban—should be brought prominently before the people of this country, the erroneous views which have been propagated concerning him corrected, and his name and fame vindicated.

Sir Percy Feilding then called on Mrs. Pott to say what she knew of the Cipher.

Mrs. Pott declined to attempt an explanation in a few words, and without diagrams. She said that the thing depended upon many small particulars, and that one might as well try to explain hieroglyphics in ten minutes, as expound the minutiæ of deciphering in a few words to a mixed audience.

Sir Percy said that he believed that Mrs. Pott had worked out the Cipher satisfactorily on her own account, and had

* Some decipherers think that these supposed "Errors" are truly hints and guides in further developments of the Cipher.—Ed. Note.

also worked out the same Ciphers which Mrs. Gallup had done. It would assist the Society very much if Mrs. Pott would give them an evening when she could explain how she herself worked out the Cipher.

Mrs. Pott replied that the subject was hardly suited to a mixed audience in a large room, it required patience and close attention. She has already printed a pamphlet, demonstrating the method of deciphering to many individuals, but she thought it a pity that people should worry themselves over this thing until the results of Mr. Mallock's researches were made known. Mrs. Pott had seen Mr. Mallock, and found him able readily to decipher 75 per cent of the Baconian italics, in accordance with Mrs. Gallup's readings. Mrs. Pott believed the remaining 25 per cent. to be equally distinguishable, if the geometrical principle be duly applied, and that when Mr. Mallock's many enlargements of deciphered pages, being made for him at the Clarendon Press, were completed, he would publish an article summing up his results.

Mr. Gay spoke boldly in favour of Mrs. Gallup, ridiculing the idea that she could have concocted a fraud with a view to gain. He appealed to Baconian writers present to say how much any one had ever made by upholding this cause. Everything published was a labour of love, carried out at much cost and almost invariable loss. He was proud of his acquaintance with Mrs. Gallup, and to be connected with her as the publisher of her work. He had done his best to get her Cipher investigated by Mr. Sydney Lee, but in vain. All that she had obtained up to the present time was abuse by men who ought to have helped her.

Dr. Washington Sullivan, in a very able speech, endorsed these remarks. He was absolutely convinced of the reality of the Cipher, and of its existence in the books named and deciphered by Mrs. Gallup. "Anyone who looked at her portrait would recognise in her a steady perseverance, and an industrious and resolute character. She was a typical New England lady."

Mrs. Pott said that Baconians who disliked the Cipher would do well to turn their attention to other branches of the great subject. Those who spoke of the vast amount of information amassed, should also consider the number of important points upon which we are still totally ignorant. We do not know when or where Francis St. Alban was born. Dr. Rawley, his Chaplain and Secretary, made the misleading statement (doubtless intentional), that he was born at

"*York House or York Place, Strand*"—expressing that the *House* or *Place* were the same building. But York House was the residence of Sir Nicholas Bacon, and was in the Strand; York Place was *not* in the Strand, but was the Palace of Whitehall. The dates given were equally confused and uncertain. Neither were definite facts known about the boyhood or youth of Francis called Bacon; or of his married life; nor were particulars known as to his death and place of burial.

Four equally reliable authorities give different records of these events. According to Dr. Rawley, he died at Highgate at the house of Lord Arundell. According to Dr. Spratt, President of the Royal Society, he died at the house of his friend and physician Dr. Parry, in a street in London. Another President (Dr. Wallis?) said that he died at the house of Dr. Witherbourne, one and a-half miles from Highgate. Fuller records that he died at the house of his cousin (*i.e.*, a cousin of the Bacons), Sir Julius Cæsar, at Mitcham.* There is strong reason for believing that Francis St. Alban died at none of these places, but that he *died to the world* in 1626, retiring for study and contemplation to some hermitage or religious house, and dying at a very advanced age.

In the course of the evening Mrs. Pott referred to the Douce MSS., *supposed to be* at the British Museum, but of which the greater portion were found to be in the Bodleian Library. Much mystery was attached to these MSS., *said to have been* left by Mr. Douce (Keeper of the MSS. Brit. Mus.) in 1834, and to be revealed to the public in 1900. They demand serious inquiry and examination.

There was also a sealed bag at the Record Office *said to have been* there since the death of Queen Elizabeth, and which was to be opened only with the joint consent of the King, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Lord Chancellor. As 1903 would be the 300th year from the death of Elizabeth, this seemed to be a fitting time for appealing to the proper authorities for permission to have this bag opened, and its secrets disclosed.

Mr. Fleming Fulcher also spoke in favour of greater activity in research, not only as to the mysteries of Bacon's life, but with regard to every new discovery or theory. Every one, he said, should keep an open mind with regard to the Biliteral and other Ciphers, which were being diligently worked out. These were not merely things to amuse school-

* Or Muswell Hill.

boys—they went far beyond the mere interest of a puzzle or a curious problem; the very opposition and controversy to which they had led are sufficient to prove that the matter revealed by them are of extraordinary interest and importance. As for Mrs. Gallup, he was strongly impressed by her straightforwardness, and painstaking, plodding perseverance. She seemed to be "essentially genuine."

Lady Durning-Lawrence described a visit paid by Mrs. Gallup and her sister Miss Wells to Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence's magnificent Baconian Library. Here Mrs. Gallup found a copy of a rare edition used in the Biliteral, but which she had not been able to procure at the time when she was deciphering; a gap had therefore been left in the printed narrative. Mrs. Gallup, in the presence of Sir Edwin and Lady Durning-Lawrence, deciphered this piece, which fitted in perfectly to the place which had been previously left a blank.

Sir Percy Feilding considered this the strongest evidence yet produced, and after a little more discussion on points connected with the advancement of the Society, and the broadening of its basis, some remarks were passed on Pope's translation of the "Iliad."

Mrs. Pott pointed out how frequently the name, Pope, variously spelt, occurs in documents of the Baconian period; for instance, in letters to Anthony Bacon (Tenison Collection, Lambeth Palace) Morgan Pope was Lessee of the Bear Garden in 1585; Thomas Pope, a distinguished Comic Actor; John Pope (father of Alexander "the poet") was one of the earliest Fellows of the Royal Society founded by Francis; Sir Thomas Pope, friend of Sir Thomas More, founded Trinity College, Oxford. Mrs. Pott said that if Alexander Pope was merely one of "Bacon's" many masks and "Handers-down of the Lamp of Tradition," it would be easy to explain the proved similarities in thought and diction which Baconians have long ago collated from the works of "Bacon" and "Pope."

Miss Alicia A. Leith drew the attention of the meeting to the fact that the special volume of Homer's "Iliad" used by Pope for his translation was a marked book, illustrated with sketches by Pope's pen, and was at one time in the possession of Lady Waldegrave. If the volume were traced and inspected closely it might throw light on certain lines alleged to exist both in Pope's and Mrs. Gallup's "Iliad," but not in Homer's. The formal meeting was shortly after this brought to a close, and ended in a pleasant conversazione.

C. M. POTT.

A HUMBLE REMONSTRANCE.

IN the April number of this review Mr. G. Stronach, M.A., honoured a previous paper of mine with some criticisms, and invited my answer to a question. May I be permitted to deal with them in somewhat the same order?

First, then, as to Miss Strickland.

As a slight corroboration of the Cipher Story, I still think it worth noting that the behaviour of Dudley and Elizabeth—at one time prisoners in the Tower, but who did not meet again until the Queen's accession—should have occasioned the remark from a learned authoress (who had searched closely into Elizabethan records and wrote long before any Cipher questions) that there must have been a secret understanding established between them while prisoners, and that the conduct of the Queen "must have originated from some powerful motive which does not appear on the surface of history."

The Ambassadors' Reports.

Next Mr. Stronach attacks the ambassadors. The ambassadors' letters are statements made in writing at the time and still preserved. It is against common sense to suggest that the ambassadors were not doing to the best of their opportunities the work they were in England for—namely, to represent and keep informed their potentates of what was going on.

There is no value in the emotional passage from Dixon quoted by Mr. Stronach.

In discussing the distasteful question of the chastity of Elizabeth, let us go direct to the documentary evidence—viz., the Seymour Papers, Ambassadors' Letters, Melville Reports, the Hatton Dyer Letters, and the Raleigh Letters, for example. Mr. Dixon's rounded sentences may appeal to the literary soul. I prefer the contemporary documents.

The Visits of Elizabeth.

Mr. Stronach objects to my inference that a mother was visiting her child at Gorhambury. I will accept his comment that nothing can necessarily be inferred as to this; but, added to the Cipher account, the facts have considerable evidential import.

She was at St. Albans when Gorhambury House was completed in August, 1568.

Anthony, according to tradition, was the elder brother of Francis. The date of the birth of the younger is recorded, that of Anthony unrecorded and unknown. There is a bust of young Francis, but not one of Anthony; a miniature by Hilliard of Francis at 18, but none of Anthony. The year this was painted the Queen gave Sir Nicholas her portrait by the same artist. She visited Gorhambury in July, 1572, and again in March, 1572-3, her visit being followed next month (April) by the despatch of Francis to Trinity College, Cambridge, at the early age of 12.

Sir Nicholas Bacon became wealthy by obtaining the forfeited estates of religious orders necessarily by grants from the Crown.

Anthony would not be sent abroad before he was educated, and there is no evidence whatever of his going before the year 1579. As between the two children, the differential treatment is singular and worth noting.

The Queen's Provision for Francis.

Mr. Stronach attacks my propositions, that Sir Nicholas made no provision for Francis, and that the Queen provided for him. Once more I rely upon the documents: first, the will of Sir Nicholas, to be seen at Somerset House, and dated 12th December, 1578, ten weeks before he died, and which makes no provision for Francis.

Against this Mr. Stronach offers statements from a biography written by Rawley about fifty years after. This account has proved a useful red herring across the paths of Mr. Spedding, Dr. Abbott, and now of Mr. G. Stronach. Sir Nicholas did not die intestate. Even adding Francis, there were not "five brothers." Had there been an intestacy, the three girls as well as the boys would have taken share, and the share would have been not a fifth of the whole fund, but a seventh of two-thirds, the other third going to the widow. Sir Nicholas could have settled by the will any provision he wished for Francis. That he did not is a material piece of evidence, and the Rawley account is neither true nor sensible. As to the other point, Mr. Stronach, with the letter of 18th October, 1580, Francis Bacon to Burleigh, before him, has the courage to deny that the Queen appointed Francis to the Court and made provision for his maintenance. This is the passage:—

"And now, *seeing that it hath pleased* her Majesty to take knowledge of this my mind, *and to vouchsafe to appropriate*

me unto her service, preventing any desert of mine by her princely liberality, first, I am moved humbly to beseech your Lordship to present to her Majesty *my more than most humble thanks therefore.*"

The Conduct of the Parties.

Mr. Stronach says that only on one occasion did Francis *offer* advice to her Majesty, but that on others his advice was asked for. I have not checked this statement, because I find Mr. Stronach wrong in his observation, that on "several occasions" Francis incurred the anger of the Queen through opposing grants to the Crown. He only opposed one—viz., for a treble subsidy,—and then only in the true interests of the Throne. His opposition, for which he was afterwards made to suffer bitterly, was withdrawn at an early stage.

Mr. Stronach very properly takes the opportunity of commenting on the Essex trial and the seeming incongruity of a mother and son prosecuting another son, and the mother afterwards causing him to be executed. Let us look at the matter carefully. A report of the trial can be found printed from an original document in Vol. III. of "State Trials," recently edited by Judge Stephen. Why was Francis present at the trial at all unless the Cipher Story gives the clue? He was neither Solicitor nor Attorney-General. At the trial he had on two occasions to interfere to keep the proceedings in something like order. Coke jeered at Essex that he wanted to become "Robert the first." Surely this is curious? Except on the Cipher clue Robert had no possible claim to the throne. Francis was evidently present by special direction of the Queen, and the burden of his first speech was simply to press upon Essex that it was better for him to *confess* than to justify. His second was directed to the same end, pointing out that it was impossible for Essex to suggest that his armed proceedings did not amount to raising up a revolution. To my mind both the mother and brother merely wanted to put a stop to Robert's masterfulness, which was becoming most dangerous to the peace of the realm. If he would confess, and promise not to further offend, all would be well eventually. It was an evident desire of Francis to stop his brother's high-spirited conduct and bring him to that condition of sweet reasonableness which I seek in the case of my friend, Mr. Stronach. The brother failed; brothers often do. Devereux's "Life of Essex" shows that

even after Robert's conviction and imprisonment in the Tower, the Queen was most anxious to secure his submission. His execution was either due to an order given by the Queen in a paroxysm of temper or to the treachery of Robert's enemies in not conveying to the Queen the tokens or proofs of his submission. The Cipher Story shows how terribly the tragedy affected Francis, and that he hated the Queen for ever onwards, but the collapse it caused to her is an indication that the warrant was only issued at a moment of passionate aberration. It must not be forgotten that death penalties and death warrants were very commonly ordered and then revoked in those days, and, like the case of Mary Queen of Scots, were sometimes used without real sanction.

The Lady Bacon Letters.

I do not press the point about the Lady Bacon correspondence.

But Mr. Stronach is wrong in stating that there are a number of letters by Francis to Lady Anne in answer to letters to her. Only *four* letters from Francis to her have ever been printed; of these, one was, and another may have been, a reply. Two further letters which Dixon quotes, viz.: 16th April, 1593, and 2nd November, 1593, Spedding says are from Anthony.

The Marriage.

With every desire to be yielding, I do not think Mr. Stronach has answered my argument as to the three years' delay before Francis married.

He was no better off in May, 1606, than in 1603, as he had no salaried post until he was created Solicitor-General on the 25th June, 1607. Having ventured to note that Francis was married in kingly purple—"from cap to shoe"—Mr. Stronach tells me the kingly reference is only to the mantle!

I therefore surrender the doublet, hose, cap, and shoes.

Arrogating Royal State and Power.

Mr. Stronach can find no charge that Francis, while at Whitehall, lent himself to the accusation of arrogating Royal State and power.

I refer him to Weldon's "Court and Character of King James," or to the extract in "Nichols' Progresses of James," Vol. III,, p. 298 :—

"Now he instantly begins to believe himself King, lyes in the King's lodgings, gives audience," &c., &c.

"Winwood, the first Secretary of State rose and went away and would never sit more but instantly despatched one to the King to desire him to haste back for his seat was already usurped." Weldon says he was present when the King read the letter from Winwood.

As to the circumstances of peculiar honour in which Francis was made Viscount St. Alban, I quoted from my copy of "Dixon's Personal History," at page 245. The statement may be incorrect. I have not large faith in Mr. Dixon's accuracy.

The Question.

Mr. Stronach, in conclusion, asks me one question:—"If Queen Elizabeth was Bacon's mother, and if, according to the Cipher Story Bacon knew the Queen *was* his mother, why in his will does he request to be buried at St. Albans, 'for there was my mother buried.'"

Mr. Stronach concludes that he is not surprised to learn that Bacon knew who his mother was better than Mr. Parker Woodward.

My reply to Mr. Stronach is that his question is based upon two assumptions which he is not able to prove. The will of Lord Bacon is not to be found, nor is it established that the Queen is not buried at St. Albans. But, granting these assumptions, why should his lordship not be permitted to allude as mother to the lady who, according to the Cipher story, was for his first sixteen years regarded as his mother, and for whom he always cherished much affection. Disowned by his real mother, estranged from his wife, childless, and worn with great suffering, was it very unnatural for him to desire to be laid at rest beside the remains of his foster mother in the grave at St. Michael's.

A close student of Macchiavelli (*vide* Dr. Fischer's "Francis Bacon of Verulam," Longmans, 1857), a writer of the Essay on *Simulation and Dissimulatiou*, the man who took the special trouble of directing his eulogy of Elizabeth to be published after his death in order to close up the current rumours concerning her, was Bacon likely to make reference to Lady Ann in any other terms than those used?

If the statement in the will is to be accepted as authentic and final, Mr. Stronach has destroyed the Cipher case.

His destructive criticism must, however, be carried to its

logical conclusion, whereby Mr. Stronach has sawn from the tree the branch upon which he and others have been sitting.

Two gentlemen of respectability, against whose character no breath of suspicion has come down to us, Messrs. Heminge and Condell, in the lifetime of Lord Bacon affirmed that the Plays in the First Folio of 1623 were written by their deceased fellow actor Shakspeare. Their statement is confirmed by a well known contemporary dramatist named Jonson. It is uncontradicted by any writing of Bacon left for publication after his death.

Apply the new test, and we must conclude that they knew who the author of the Plays was better than Mr. G. Stronach, M.A.

PARKER WOODWARD.

"THE MISFORTUNES OF ARTHUR."

THE tragedy called *The Misfortunes of Arthur*, produced in 1587, is a Play with which the name of Bacon is expressly connected and the name of Shakespeare is certainly not. But Baconians hesitate to point to it with a firm finger as evidence for them in the controversy as to "Shakespeare" authorship, because they fairly admit that the extent to which Bacon is alleged to have contributed to this Play is limited to the "dumb shewes." In Mr. Donelly's admirable work with the inadequate title, "The Great Cryptogram," which does not rightly describe the first and convincing volume of evidence, he refers (Vol. I., p. 249) to *The Misfortunes of Arthur*, cites Mr. Payne Collier's preface to the reprint of it in Dodsley's old Plays, and says, "I will discuss this Play and its merits at more length hereafter, and will make but one or two observations upon it at this time." He then suggests that the work, of which "Thomas Hughes" is stated to be the author, may have been, in fact, written by Bacon. The promised discussion is, however, not to be found in Mr. Donelly's book. Perhaps the absorbing labour of decipherment prevented him from carrying out his intentions towards the Play in question. But it is worth discussing, and these lines are written with the hope of directing the keen eyes of Baconian experts to the original text. A little more light has lately been thrown on the identity of the alleged author, and the question, at least, is worth considering whether Bacon had not a larger share in the composition of an epoch-making

Play than appears from the statements as to the authorship which are interspersed between the divisions of it with almost suspicious particularity.

The Play is historical, and may have been the outcome of an idea of dramatising the History of England from the commencement. The literary style is peculiar. An effort seems to have been carefully made to blend the alliteration used in Saxon poetry with more exact and harmonious blank verse than any previously written in English. The original print is said to be unique, and in the Garrick Collection. It is entitled: "Certaine Devises and Shewes presented to her Majestie by the Gentlemen of Grayes-Inne at her Highnesses Court in Greenwich, the twenty-eighth day of Februarie, in the thirtieth year of her Majesties most happy Raigne. At London. Printed by Robert Robinson, 1587 B.L." It states that eight members of the Society of Gray's Inn took part in the production of the Play. The Introduction is attributed to Nicholas Trotte, whose name is at the foot of it. The next page is headed, "The Misfortunes of Arthur (Arthur Pendragon's sonne), reduced into tragicall notes by *Thomas Hughes*, one of the societie of Grayes-Inne. And here set down as it passed from under his handes, and as it was presented, excepting certaine wordes and lines, where some of the Actors either helped their memories by brief omissions or fitted their acting to some alteration. With a note in the ende of such speeches as were penned by others, in lue of some of these hereafter following." After the Epilogue and "Finis" is the name *Thomas Hughes*. Then "Heere after follow such speeches as were penned by others, and pronounced instead of some of the former speeches penned by Thomas Hughes. A speach penned by William Fulbecke, gentleman, one of the societie of Grayes-Inne, and pronounced instead of Gorlois his first speeche penned by Thomas Hughes, and set downe in the first Scene of the first Acte." After the substituted speech—"One other speeche penned by the same gentleman, and pronounced instead of Gorlois his last speache penned by Thomas Hughes, and set downe in the second Scene of the fifth and last Act." And after this "other speeche"—"Besides these speaches there was also penned a Chorus for the first Act, and another for the second Act, by Maister Francis Flower, which were pronounced accordingly. The dumbe shewes were partly devised by Maister Christopher Yelverton, Maister Frauncis Bacon, Maister John Lancaster, and others, partly by the said Maister Flower, who with

Maister Penroodocke, and the said Maister Lancaster, directed these proceedings at Court."

Mr Payne Collier, in his edition of 1833, says that nothing was known about Hughes, Trotter, Flower, Lancaster, and Penroodocke. But from the "Pension Book" of Gray's Inn, recently published for the Society, and edited by the Rev. R. J. Fletcher, it now appears that Thomas Hughes was called to the Bar in 1585, Trotte in 1584, Lancaster was elected an Ancient in 1587, and Penroodocke Reader in 1584. Of Francis Flower we have still no information. Fulbecke was born in 1566. Bacon was 28 years old at the time of the representation of the Play, and Yelverton as early as 1566 had written the Epilogue to Gascoyne's "Jocasta," so must have been of much riper years. It follows, therefore, that four of the members were young men, three elderly men, and Flower of uncertain age.

Although Thomas Hughes is alleged to be the author of the Play, except certain substituted speeches, a difference in the style and merit of certain parts of the Play is perceptible. Mr. Payne Collier does not point out this fact in his Preface to the reprint of 1828. He says, however, "The mere rarity of this unique drama would not have recommended it to our notice; but it is not likely that such a man as Lord Bacon would have lent his aid to the production of a piece which was not intrinsically good, and unless we much mistake, there is a richer and a nobler vein of poetry running through it, than is to be found in any previous work of the kind." Those acquainted with prior and contemporaneous Plays will surely be of opinion that the devoted editor of "Shakespeare" did not "much mistake." As the reprint is not in every book-case the writer proposes to cite some passages that the reader may judge whether they do or do not resemble the writing of "Shakespeare." Let him notice the antithetical style, the statements *pro* and *con*, the original ideas, and he may also be reminded of the writing of Bacon.

The theme of the tragedy is the return of Arthur after wars abroad to find his wife unfaithful, and his realm usurped by Modred, his son, their civil war and its end. The gloom of the subject is unlightened by any touch of comedy.

The Introduction is a clever attack by one of the Muses on the study of laws and a defence by a law student in correct blank verse, with little or no alliteration.

After the "Argument of the Tragedie," and a list of *dramatis personæ*, comes "Gorlois' First Speech." This,

stated to have been penned by "Thomas Hughes," was, however, not pronounced, nevertheless it is clearly superior to that "penned by William Fulbecke," which was substituted for it.

"Hughes'" speech is a kind of prologue and ends with a prophecy in compliment to Elizabeth, which is an example of pleasant and mellifluous alliteration:—

> " . . . O Cassiopæa, gembright signe,
> Most sacred sight, and sweet cælestial starre,
> This clymat's joy, plac'd in imperiall throne,
> With fragrant olive branche portending peace;
> For you there rests
> A happier age, a thousand yeares to come;
> An age for peace, religion, wealth, and ease,
> When all the world shall wonder at your blisse."

These lines anticipate the complimentary prophecy by Cranmer in *Henry VIII.*

In the Second Scene, between Guenevera and Fronia, the Queen is raging at the return of Arthur, and breathes revenge; *Fronia* tries to calm her:—

> "A ladie's best revenge is to forgive.
> What meane is in your hate?"
>
> *Guenevera:* "And would you know what mean there is in hate,
> Call love to minde, and see what meane is there."

And in the Third Act her sister, *Angharat,* answering her, despairing, says:—

> "Then it is best to die when friends doe mourne.
> Echwhere is death! the fates have well ordainde,
> That ech man may bereave himself of life,
> But none of death: death is so sure a doome,
> A thousand wayes doe guide us to our graves;
> Who then can ever come too late to that,
> Whence, when h'is come, he never can returne?
> Or what auailes to hasten on our ends,
> And long for that which destenies have sworne!"

Towards the end of the Scene *Angharat,* consoling her sister, says:—

> "Love is an error that may blind the best."

Guenevera:

"A mightie error oft hath seemde a sinne.
My death is vowed, and death must needes take place.
But such a death as stands with just remorse:
Death to the world and to her slipperie joys:
A full divorce from all this courtly pompe,
Where dayly pennance done for each offence
May render due revenge for every wrong,
Which to accomplish, pray, my deerest friends
That they forthwith, attyrde in saddest guise,
Conduct me to the Cloister next hereby,
There to professe, and to renounce the world."

The Fourth Scene of Act I. consists of argument between the *Queen*, *Modred* and *Conan*, as to the line of action to be taken against Arthur.

Modred suggests "war."
Conan: "That lies in chaunce."
Modred: "I have as great a share in chaunce as he."
Conan: "His waies be blinde that maketh chaunce his guide."
Modred: "Whose refuge lies in chaunce, what dares he not?"
Conan: "Warres were a crime, farre worse than all the rest."
Modred: "The safest passage is from bad to worse."

And so on. In the Second Act Arthur has gained the first success over *Modred*, who, in similar style of alternate lines or short passages, discusses the situation first with *Conan* and then with *Gawain*.

The Third Act begins with argument between *Arthur*, disposed to forbearance towards his rebellious son, and *Howell* and *Cador*, who incite him to be stern.

Says *Cador:*

". . . No worse a vice than lenitie in kings;
Remisse indulgence soone undoes a realme:
He teacheth how to sinne that winkes at sinnes,
And bids offend that suffereth an offence.
The onely hope of leave increaseth crimes,
And he that pardoneth one, emboldneth all
To breake the lawes. Each patience fostereth wrongs.
But vice severely punisht faints at foote,
And creepes no further off than where it falls.

One sower example will prevent more vice
Than all the best perswasions in the world . . ."

Arthur replies:

"Compassion is as fit for kings as wrath."

And the philosophical conversation proceeds in the same strain, enriched with many fine lines. But a herald comes with a defiance from *Modred*, and the King is aroused.

Arthur:

"Hath all the bloud we spent on forreine coasts
The wounds and deaths and winters boad abroade,
Deserved thus to be disgrac'd at home?
All Brytaine rings of warres: no towne nor fielde
But swarmes with armed troupes: the mustering trians
Stop up the streets; . . .
Let him come
With sodaine soldiers pampered up in peace.
. . . . . .
They shall perceave with sorrow 'er they part,
When all their toyles be told, that nothing workes
So great a waste and ruine in this age
As doe my warres."

Space will not admit of the quotations which might be made from the Fourth Act in which the incidents of the war are narrated by *Nuncius*, and Arthur does not appear; but the whole Act seems inferior to the Third.

In the Fifth *Arthur* appears again, and regrets his successes:—

"This only now I crave (O fortune 'erst
My faithful friend), let it be soone forgot.
Nor long in minde, nor mouth where Arthur fell:
Yea, though I conqueror die, and full of fame,
Yet let my death and parture rest obscure.
No grave I neede (O fates) nor buriall rights,
Nor stately hearce, nor tombe with haughty toppe;
But let my carcase lurke; yea, let my death
Be ay unknowen, so that in every coast
I still be fear'd and lookt for every houre."

The above extracts may be enough to send readers to the Play itself. After reading it they will perhaps ask themselves why, if "Thomas Hughes" really wrote it, he wrote no more? *If*——

J. R. (of Gray's Inn).

THE DIGNITY OF CIPHER WRITING.

IT is to be regretted that the venerable art of writing in cipher is regarded now-a-days as little better than a toy. The present age, happening to have outgrown this particular subject, is apt to view it with a contemptuous, and perhaps a somewhat intolerant eye. In the following brief sketch the endeavour has been made to bring together a few facts which should tend to dispel the current contempt which obscures the subject. Though decayed and discredited to-day, cipher-writing has attracted great minds in past ages, and can claim an almost unparalleled ancestry.

"It is clear," says the author of "The Golden Remains of the Early Masonic Writers" (Oliver. London, 1847, 5 vols.) "the Egyptian Priests used a cipher which was known to none but themselves, and it was retained after alphabetical characters came into common use.* This was the sacred hieroglyphic which was rendered abstruse and unintelligible by the adoption of a new or esoteric meaning to the ordinary symbolic hieroglyphics."

"The royal soothsayer Mehrarish is said to have written more then 1,000 volumes which none could understand but those who had been instructed by himself. Various ciphers were also invented by several of the kings of Egypt, as well as by sooth-sayers, magicians, philosophers and others, whose names have been preserved, and particularly by Cophtrim, one of the kings of Egypt, who has the reputation of having composed an encyclopædia of all the sciences in a secret cipher of his own."

In Book VI. of "The Advancement of Learning," Bacon alludes to the enigmatic and achroamatic methods of publishing books which were employed by the ancients, and states that "the same we will transfer to the manner itself of delivery." One is inclined to conjecture whether he was alluding to Cophtrim or Mehrarish, and again to the same subject when he wrote in cipher.

"Yet shall I use a most blind waye . . . as th' wonderfully curious devices we have heard it said much occupied people of ancient Egypt." ("Biliteral Cipher," p. 22).

Of the disciples of Pythagoras, a philosopher whose aim was precisely that of Francis Bacon—the reformation and the

* The sacred Egyptian monolith on the Embankment, which marks the spot where York House once stood, is said to be inscribed with Masonic characters.—[ED. NOTE].

education of mankind—Lempriere states: "When they were capable of receiving the secret instructions of the philosopher, they were taught the use of *ciphers*," and it is probable that Bacon had in his mind the systems of Hermes Trismegistus, or of Pythagoras when he wrote: "That the discretion anciently observed . . . of publishing part *and reserving part to a private succession*, and of publishing in a manner whereby it shall not be to the capacity or taste of all, but shall, as it were single and adopt its reader, is not to be laid aside, both for the avoiding of abuse in the excluded and the strengthening of affection in the admitted."

According to Spedding, the words "*ad filios*," are inscribed in Bacon's handwriting on the left hand corner of the MS. of his *Filum Labyrinthi*. I have not come across any previous note of this fact, which appears difficult of explanation, except as a dedication to his disciples, or Sons of Science, "the true succession of wits" which was to carry out his contemplative ends.

Those who are disposed to regard anagrams, acrostics and such like, as puerilities unworthy of serious attention, would do well to remember that "The Sybilline books of the Romans were written in a cipher which Cicero describes as a complication of acrostics. They were so written that the letters of the first verse of every section commenced all the succeeding verses in the same order as they occupied in the first verse."

It is neither impossible nor unlikely that Bacon determined that he would better antiquity in this, as well as in other respects.

Suetonius tells us that Julius Cæsar was what the modern journalist would term a "ciphermonger."

Æneas Tacitus collected twenty different cipher systems, and invented several new ones. He appears to have been an even more inveterate ciphermonger than Bacon.

Few realise what an extraordinary outburst of books on cipher-writing there was in the sixteenth century. To quote a sprightly writer: "Those who care for the archæological side of the subject may refer to the writings of Palatino, dating 1540, of Bellaso in 1553, and of Glanburg in 1560. Should this not have damped their ardour, they may next take a course of Porta, Trithemius, Cardanus, Walchius, Bibliander, Schottus, Selenus, Herman Hugo, Niceron, Caspi, Tridenci, Comiers, La Fin, Dalgarno, Buxtorff, Wolfgang and Falconer. Even then, if they so wish it, are open to them the writings of Eidel,

Soro, Amman, Breitkampt, Conradus, De Vaines, Lucatello, Kircher, and not a few others, while for those who do not care to dig their knowledge out of such dusty worm-eaten tomes, William Blair is the very thing." ("Cryptography." F. E. Hume, London).

Descending to the year 1847, we find the author of "The Golden Remains of Freemasonry" asserting that "The System of cipherwriting has been found so convenient *as a depository of ineffable secrets*, that it has descended down to our own times, and various methods have been prescribed for its use . . . In the higher degrees of sublime Masonry, there are several ciphers, almost every degree possessing an exclusive method of communication . . . The Cabalists used a numerical cipher. By placing the letters of the alphabet under the numbers as far as 24, they constituted words out of figures, and by adding together the result they propounded mystical questions, and solved abstruse and difficult problems. The cipher used by Weishaupt in his system of illuminism was a substitution of figures for letters."

Adam Weishaupt (1748-1830), was the founder of the best known sect of Illuminati. He "set himself to combat ignorance, superstition and tyranny, by founding an association which should be a luminous centre for the promotion of rational and religious enlightenment."

Weishaupt's cipher appears to have been a modification of the numerical system used by the Cabbala. The Cabbala was a secret system of theology and metaphysics largely based upon, and in close connection with, the Pythagorean philosophy. It is noteworthy that the Cabbalists, like all mediæval mystics attached superstitious importance to anagrams. We are told that they never plainly explained their mystic principles, but "les envelopoient sous les paroles les plus obscures comme autrefois les Pythagoriens qui ne produisoient leurs secrets que sous les enigmas tant *poir se faire remarquer que pour exciter la curiosite des savants* and suprendre les ignorants." (Traite des Signes de nos pensees. Costadau. Vol. ii., p. 123. Lyons, 1717).

Compare the italicised words with the following passage: "Puny little mindes, th' type most familiar to us, take much delight in talke. Th' surer methode to secure attention, is to put his written works in such a peculiar or secret form that it wakeneth th' curious to seek them." ("Biliteral Cipher," Bacon, p. 57).

It would baffle the wit of man to accurately define the distinction between the Cabbalists, the Rosicrucians, the

Illuminati, the Freemasons and the hundred and one secret sects that have flourished from times prehistoric down to the present day. It is apparent that many, if not all, of them employed cipherwriting. The author of "The Golden Remains of Freemasonry" states that: "The meaning of the [Heraldic] ciphers is no secret to those who will take the trouble of searching for it, but the study is so dry and forbidding, that the cipher is *almost as unattainable as the cipher of Freemasonry.*"

To what do the italicised words refer? What was "The Cipher of Freemasonry?" and where is it to be sought? Does Bacon's Biliteral unlock an unexpected El Dorado of information, "a depository of ineffable secrets?"

The writer concludes as follows:—"The reader of this essay must not understand that I have brought forward every possible evidence on the curious subject of cipher-writing. I have merely opened it, leaving it to those who have a taste for such investigations to take up the thread which I have spun, and to follow out the ideas that I have touched upon. *The mine is uncovered, let it be freely worked, and it will yield an abundance of sterling ore.*" ("Golden Remains," Vol. v., p. 31).

HAROLD BAYLEY.

THE OWL AND THE BAKER'S DAUGHTER.

IN "An Inventory of the Plate, Household Stuff, Pictures, &c., in Kenilworth Castle," taken after the death of Robert Earl of Leycester, 1588, there is an item, to which Baconians will be glad to have attention drawn, although there is nothing new in the particulars which we are about to state. As will be seen by the footnote,* all this has been for nearly half a century perfectly well known to antiquaries, historians, and learned Shakespeareans: known and even in print for the curious, and for a certain class of readers, but not set before the public so as to attract attention. As usual with such scraps of information bearing upon our subject, the question, which has for years interested Shakespearean commentators, has been discreetly kept behind the curtain.

* The Inventory is printed in "*Amye Robsart and the Earl of Leicester*," by G. Adelard, 1870, and had previously been printed by J. O. Halliwell Phillips from a "transcript of the original MS. *in private hands.*" See "Halliwell's Ancient Inventories," 4to, printed "*for private circulation only*" by J. E. Adlard, 1854. Of this elegantly printed volume, it is certified by the printer *only twenty-five copies* were printed. Why?

In the "Inventory of Pictures" we read first of "Two great tables of the Queene's Majesties' pictures with one curtaine of changeable silck; two great pictures of my Lord in whole proporcion, . . . with one curtaine to them," pictures of St. Jerome, of the Lords Arundel, Maltravers, and Pembroke, of Count Egmont, the Queen of Scots and King Philip. Then follows:—

"THE PICTURE OF THE BAKER'S DAUGHTER."*

It is the only picture in the collection, excepting one of "Occacion and Repentance," which is not of some distinguished personage. *There is no picture of Amy Robsart or Lettice Knowles,* married or unmarried.

Now, with regard to this entry of the baker's daughter, it is, as Mr. Adelard says (p. 267, "Notes"), "of extreme interest in connection with its most probable allusion to the same subject in the tragedy of *Hamlet:* 'They say, *The owl was a baker's daughter.*'" The writer questions the possibility that this very picture had been seen by *Shakespeare,* and had furnished him with the idea of introducing into the Play the subject of the legend, which is also the subject of the picture, and which is as follows:—

"Our Saviour went into a baker's shop, where they were baking, and asked for some bread to eat. The mistress of the shop immediately put a piece of dough into the oven to bake for Him, but was reprimanded by her daughter, who, insisting that the piece of dough was too large, reduced it to a very small size. The dough, however, immediately afterwards began to swell, and presently became of a most enormous size; whereupon the baker's daughter cried out—'*Heugh, heugh, heugh!*' which owl-like noise probably induced our Saviour, for her wickedness, to transform her into an owl."

The legend is, according to Adelard, "related by Douce from oral tradition," though from whom Douce derived the oral tradition is not revealed. The fact that he was made the depository of such communications renders us all the

* The other portraits are of the Duke of Feria, Alex. Magnus, Two Young Ladies, Pompœa Sabina, Fredk. Duke of Saxony, Emperor Charles, King Philip's Wife, Prince of Orange, Marquess of Berges, Count Horn, Count Holstrate, Duke of Alva, Cardinal Granville, Duchess of Parma, Henry Earl of Pembroke, Countess Mary Sydney, Countess Essex, Lord Montacute, Sir J. Crofts, Sir Wm. Mildmay, Sir Wm. Pickering, Edwin (Sandys), second Archbishop of York.

more eager to become thoroughly well acquainted with the Douce MSS. in the Bodleian and the British Museum, and to fathom the mysteries connected with their present state of semi-suppression or partial concealment.

But to return to the baker's daughter. In 1862, Mr. W. J. Thoms printed in *Notes and Queries* * a list of the pictures at Kenilworth, being apparently unaware that the Inventory had been already printed in 1854. At the end of the list Mr. Thoms says:—

"There is one picture in this list respecting which I would make a special query—*What is the picture of the baker's daughter?* Could we suppose it to represent the legend to which Shakespeare refers in *Hamlet*—'*The* owl was a baker's daughter,'—we might see in this allusion a recollection of one of the many visits which Shakespere doubtless paid to the glories of Kenilworth."

Mr. Thoms seems here to have confused his spellings. Of *Shakspere* there is no hint, no scintilla of evidence that he ever was at Kenilworth. Excepting for the purpose of making the supposition fit in with the rest of his apocryphal history, there has never been a suggestion made by any biographer of whom we have yet heard, that Shakspere, Shaksper, Shakspurre, Shaxpur, or any man with a name of that sound, was in any capacity a visitor at Kenilworth Castle. To say that Shakspere *doubtless paid many visits* to the glories of that historic place, is therefore to draw a bow so long as to fit the arms of Guy of Warwick himself.

On the other hand, if, as we have growing cause to believe, "*Shakespeare*"—Francis called "Bacon"—was in truth a son of Robert Earl of Dudley and Queen Elizabeth, his presence at Kenilworth would not only be probable and likely, but almost certain or undoubted. When he was about 15 years old, the *Princely Pleasures* were conducted—a right Royal entertainment, given by Dudley to Elizabeth, of which Robert Laneham, an eye-witness, is said to have given the account, but in which the "Gallant Device" or open-air masque is attributed to Gascoigne.

Several hands may have helped to pen this device, and to arrange the performance, but the speeches and songs of Echo, Proteus, Diana, Mercury, Iris, and others are so absolutely in the youthful manner of Francis "Bacon," so full of his conceits, his favourite metaphors, expressions, *Promus* Notes, &c.,

* *Notes and Queries*, Third Series, No. 37, Sept. 13, 1862.

that considering the general poverty of language at that date, and that *he alone* was apparently alive to the fact and bent upon enriching his mother tongue from his own stores, considering also the striking analogies found in this with other pieces now ascribed to Francis in his youth, we, the unimportant writer, do not hesitate to add this device to the long list of his juvenile productions. We go further, and consider it in the highest degree probable that the *Squire Minstrel omitted by Laneham*, but picked out for special notice by Tomlin, and by Nichol in his "*Queen Elizabeth's Progresses*" was none other than this brilliant boy, the budding, but concealed poet, Francis Dudley.

An article on Canonbury Tower appeared in BACONIANA, April, 1900,* wherein this performance of the *Squire Minstrel* was described. The fact that at the royal entertainment given by Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, *at Kenilworth*, the *Squire Minstrel* should have been "arrayed in a tabard, especially designed and embroidered to commemorate Canonbury" with its dairy farm of cream, butter, and frumenty, is in that article commented upon as strange and noteworthy, and an attempt is made to connect the delightful summer resort of Canonbury, its pleasant fields, gardens, salubrious air, and "cream farms," with the happy childhood of Elizabeth, and of Robert Dudley. They seem at the age of eight years to have passed many sunny days in one of the houses belonging to Henry VIII., and which stood upon this estate.†

Baconians who have not read this paper, and a sequel in BACONIANA, July, 1900, Vol. VIII., No. 31, will do well to inquire into this curious matter.

We have often urged the necessity in Baconian research for putting two and two together; for indeed the secrets of Baconism are, we are convinced, to be discovered only by the working out of analogies, and by the connecting of disjointed links. In the present case we see first, that a picture (unique in the collection of which it forms part) is connected with a legend alluded to in a Shakespeare play. Next we find the speech of the unnamed *Squire Minstrel* alluding to the happy childish days of Elizabeth and Dudley; then again, we find that Elizabeth gave Dudley a mansion at Kew, called the "*Dairy House.*" He was living there, whilst his wife Amye was at Cunmor, under the charge of Sir Anthony

* Vol. VIII., No. 30.

† One special one at Stoke Newington was used by Henry VIII. as a country house for his children when they needed change of air.—ED. NOTE.

Foster. From this "*Dairy House*" at Kew, Lord Robert Dudley wrote a letter to his brother's kinsman, Thomas Blount, instructing him to make inquiries as to the death of Lady Dudley, because he was becoming uneasy "as to how the matter falleth out." Dudley's anxiety was (on his own showing) caused by fear lest he should be considered privy to the act. He was staying at Windsor when the news of his wife's death reached him, but we observe that he made no effort to go to Cunmor or personally to examine into the tragedy, he merely went to the "*Dairy House*" at Kew, and conducted his examination such as it was, by letter. We seem to be digressing from the subject in hand, but it will be seen that there is a slight and hidden thread connecting all these episodes. Was there some underlying meaning or standing jest in these triple allusions to dairy farms, in each case linking Dudley with Elizabeth? Was Francis, in "the many visits which he doubtless paid" to Kenilworth Castle, impressed by the story of the Baker's Daughter, and did he in later life incorporate it with his finest tragedy? Or is there some other more occult meaning *known to the traditional members of his own Society*, attaching to that legend?

It is only right to add that Mr. Thoms in the following number of *Notes and Queries* to that in which he had given his own view of the legend, adds:—"Since my first communication appeared, my friend, Mr. H. Foss has suggested that the picture of the Baker's Daughter . . . is the well-known 'Fornarina' of Raffael, while Mr. J. G. Nichols, judging from the pictures of Philip and the Baker's Daughter being together, inclines to the opinion that they were companions, and that the latter was the portrait of a female respecting whom there was a scandal current during Mary's life; it being said in an old ballad that Philip loved:—

> "The baker's daughter in her russet gown,
> Better than Queen Mary without her crown."

Whichever version be the true one, Francis would as well have known of the one as of the other, but that advocated by Mr. Thoms recommends itself to our own mind as the most likely, especially since it was handed down by oral tradition.

These are only some loose notes and jottings, suggestive, not dictatorial. Of such our Francis would say, "Let it be inquired."

P. C.

WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE.

A Critical Study by George Brandes.*

TO explain the Danish element in Hamlet our author tells us, that in 1585 a troupe of English players appeared in the Courtyard of the Town Hall of Elsinore. Adding, that if we be justified in assuming these to have been the same as those established at Court, 1586, then William Kempe, George Bryan and Thomas Pope were amongst them. English actors, under Thomas Sackville, performed at Copenhagen, 1596, at the Coronation of Christian IV. It is significant that even Brandes does not attempt to hint that Shaxspur made one of this touring company. William Kempe, we know, visited most of the German Courts, so we are not surprised to find him at the Danish one.

To Lilly's *Euphues* Brandes points, as well as to Montaigne's Essays. "Writers like Montaigne and Lilly," he says, "were no doubt constantly in Shakespeare's hands, while *Hamlet* was taking shape within him," and, "there is no doubt that he (Lilly) exercised a very important influence upon Shakespeare's dramatic style." A letter of Ferardo from Euphues contains the same arguments as the King used to Hamlet on the unreasonableness of his "obstinate condolement" on his father's death; while Ferardo's words to Lucilla ring strangely like Hamlet's to Ophelia. "For oftentimes thy mother would saye that thou haddest more beautie than was convenient for one that shoulde bee honeste," and "O Lucilla, Lucilla, woulde thou were lesse fayre!" Old men in *Euphues* giving advice to young men appear with: "hoary hair and watery eyes," and Euphues repulses an old gentleman "whose intellect seems as tottering as his legs." In this "Anatomy of Wit," so like in title that "Anatomy of Melancholy" which we learn by the Gallup Cipher was Francis Saint Alban's work, we may yet find that he "painted the Lilly," originating the work in which Brandes, too credulous, only sees analogy. Brandes is more cautious than Beyersdorf, whom he quotes, and whom he accuses of claiming for Lilly the origin of some of Shakespeare's ideas. Brandes, while he says "that insults the genius of Shakespeare," fails in his logic, for he puts Montaigne and Euphues into our author's hands and babbles of "analogy." Shakespeare was either a plagiarist or he was not. Looking at the matter dispassionately, and accepting

* William Heineman, 1898.

the view put forward by Brandes and his school, Shakespeare stole freely, not only ideas but words from other writers without a blush. In our opinion the author of the Shakespeare Plays had no need to borrow from other men's minds, because his was immeasurably superior. He was *Albanus*, "the loftiest hill—out-topping knowledge."

Brandes puts forward one very reasonable theory, indeed, he has stumbled on what may prove to be a great truth, though he has not a shadow of evidence to offer for our acceptance of it. The fact being that his premises are false, while we, who build on the right foundation, may use his theory and profit by it. He suggests that the Plays are the mirror in which we may see the soul of the writer and the events which lightened and clouded it.

Before touching on this in detail we will note a few characteristics of the man Shaxpur, according to Brandes, the man Francis Saint Alban as we know him.

"His anti-democratic spirit sprang from his heart of hearts. His aristocratic contempt for the mob had its root in purely physical aversion for the atmosphere of the people—their evil smell repelled Shakespeare, more sensitive to noxious fumes than any woman." To prove this he quotes from 2 *Henry IV.*: "It will be stinking law, for his breath stinks of toasted cheese" (Act IV. sc. 7). "In their thick breaths rank of gross diet, shall we be enclouded" (*Antony and Cleopatra*, Act V. sc. 2). "The rabblement . . . uttered such a deal of stinking breath," etc., etc. (*Julius Cæsar*, Act I. sc. 2, and a similar passage in *Coriolanus*, Act II. sc. 4).

Considering the birth, life, and death of the Stratford player, to claim for him words and sentiments such as these, is, to say the least of it, ludicrous. On the other hand, in every way do they accord with the patrician Francis. There is no guessing here, we have solid fact to work on.

He was noted for his delicate nostril. His biographers record his dislike for all rank smelling things. The odour of neat-leather boots was an offence to him, this peculiarity he shared with Elizabeth, as Tennyson reminds us in "Queen Mary." On the Bench he carried a nosegay of herbs, in the study he condemned in no measured terms the poisonous emanations of jails and jailbirds, and, indeed, of all crowds; using the same nervous adjective that occurs in the passages referred to in the Plays. Was there ever a more critical discriminator between foetid breaths and fragrant odours, or one with a more subtle appreciation for perfume and gums,

and the dainty scents of herbs and flowers, than the author of "The Natural History?"

On the other hand, it is a physiological truth that the habits indulged in by topers (William Shaxpur died of a drunken bout) is a certain destroyer of the sense of smell. Besides, is it reasonable to expect the rude peasant, the prison reprobate, the butcher and tanner's son, the stable help, the tavern roysterer, whose youthful nose was inured from the cradle to a midden heap before the paternal door, to be over particular where a smell was in question? His position in life doomed him to smells, which, happily for him, he remained unconscious of. But the refined and cultured courtier, whose very gloves were scented lest they might prove unpleasant in the wearing? The poet whose dinner table was strewn with fair scented blossoms for the refreshing of the senses? The lover of woodbine, and sweet briar, and violets for the odours which they give? With him, of course, it was very different. His patrician instincts prove themselves in such lines as these: "The ignorant and rude multitude, the vulgar to whom nothing moderate is grateful" ("*Wisdom of the Ancients*"). "If fame be from the common people it is commonly false and naught" (Essay of *Praise*). "The rude multitude, the vulgar" (*The Tempest*).

With one other touch characteristic of Francis' life story Brandes infers from Caius Marcius' words (*Cor.* Act I. sc. 1): "Who deserves greatness, deserves your hate," that their author suffered from "envy and hatred raised by the small and the mean." Nowhere in the actor's life do we trace any conspiracy for keeping him "under." It was, as far as we can judge, only his own paucity of talent that prevented him shining as a star of the first magnitude in his profession. With Francis, the proto-martyr of James' reign, it was different. "Envy," as he tells us in his Essay, "is as the sunbeams that beat hotter upon a bank than upon a flat." No more flagrant case of the power of envy to ruin a life can be shown than in his fall. With what almost seems to be bitter irony, when one surveys the life of the actor Shaxpur, Brandes interprets *Coriolanus*' "repellant arrogance" thus:

"There arose in Shakespeare's soul, from the depths of his stormy contempt for humanity, a pride immeasurably pure and steadfast." In the face of Stratford tradition, this is more than ridiculous; is there any one in their heart of hearts who would accuse Shaxburd of this attribute?

Brandes tells us that the author of the Plays "was brimful

of scorn for the masses, for the stupidity, fickleness, cowardice of ignorant slavish souls, and for the baseness of their leaders." If this is so, it is to Francis and his views of men and manners, and not to the "base and common" though withal "useful fellow" Shaxburd, we must look for corroboration.

Brandes, among other Plays, takes *Troilus and Cressida*, and notes the passionate hatred and boundless bitterness with which Cressida is delineated. He puts *Antony and Cleopatra* first as to date, *Troilus* second. But Mr. Bompas gives 1599 as the probable date of *Troilus*, and 1608 as the year in which *Antony and Cleopatra* was written. This bears out the Cipher story, in which Marguerite of Navarre's inconstancy is given as the *raison d'être* for Cressida. History tells us Francis married his pretty wife in 1606, which was about the time he must have been busy on the loves of Antony and his beautiful Queen.

1591 is the date Mr. Bompas gives for the first draft of *Romeo and Juliet*, the embodiment, as the Cipher says, of Francis' boyish, romantic passion for the French Princess, and the "product," Brandes remarks, "of truth and faith." In *Troilus* we have the sequel (if the Cipher be proved genuine) of the love story. For Troilus, "giddy with happiness, uplifted to the heavens, awakes from his intoxication, betrayed." "Spiritually repulsive, Cressida's very coquetry is void of charming qualities." The author of this Play may well be the same as he who wrote: "Love is the argument always of *Comedies*, and many times of *Tragedies*. Which showeth well that it is a passion generally light, and sometimes extreme."* And: "To love and be wise is scarcely allowed to a God."† In the 1625 British Museum copy we have this additional remark: "But in life it (love) doth much mischiefe, sometimes like a Syren, sometimes like a Fury."

Mr. Bompas, in his lately published admirable little volume, "The Problem of the Shakespeare Plays," traces so many analogies between the Plays and the events in Francis' life that this article may seem to be superfluous, except that while pointing out some of Brandes' most illogical deductions, I would hope to lead readers to make a study of his interesting book, a study which must from its very nature be most fruitful in Baconian results.

In the *Tempest*, produced at Whitehall in 1611, Brandes notes sufferings in the author, who, "absorbed in occupations

* "Essay of Love," Ed. 1612. † Posthumous Latin Ed. 1638.

of a higher nature, had neglected his worldly interests and had fallen a victim to his own careless trustfulness." "Superhuman man of spirit, he subdued nature within and without, and overcame the bitterness caused by his wrongs, in the harmony of his own richly spiritual life." Thus speaks Brandes of Prospero. What better words could we use to delineate our great philosopher, who "finds it easy to forgive because he sets very little value on what he has lost." Dr. Garnett adds his witness to the *Tempest* being autographical, and to "showing what discipline of life has made of Shakespeare." Brandes claims for both hero and author "a conscious superiority, untinged by arrogance, genial scorn for the mean and base, mercifulness into which contempt entered very largely, serenity excluding passionate affection while admitting tenderness."

"It is Shakespeare's own nature," he says, "which overflows in Prospero. Thus the magician represents not merely the noble-minded great man, but the genius, imaginatively delineated."

What better word picture could have been drawn of Francis in his later life, the victim of base ingratitude, of mean and petty envy and spite? But Shaxburd! Where in the world does Brandes trace all this greatness in his smug provincial prosperity?

It seems as though every parallel to the Plays afforded by the life of the actor is, by Brandes' own showing, conspicuous by its absence.

Among the Plays of the "dark period" is *Timon of Athens*. "In harmony," as Brandes tells us, "with his own (the author's) distraught, excited frame of mind at that time."

The picture is of "a thoughtlessly, extravagantly open-handed nature, whose one pleasure is to give. He no more disturbs himself about the melting of his money from his coffers than if he were living in a communistic society with the general wealth at his disposal. The tide turns. Timon has to go a'borrowing. Requests for loans are refused by former friends; he cuts himself off from his friends, and retreats to the woods to lead the solitary life of a stoic. He digs for roots, dwells in a cave, curses and shuns mankind. The plot is scanty; it is a parable rather than a Drama." These are Brandes' words, his briefly quoted record of Timon the misanthropist.

Ingenuously he has now to confess that he can find no reason for the introduction of "this patron of artists and

merchants, this Maecenus," into the Plays. He is pathetically at a loss to account for Timon. Timon puts him altogether out of his reckonings; Timon bewilders him. We, on the contrary, take up the thread of Francis Saint Alban's life, and find Timon fitting into his place as we should expect him to do. Engaged in pursuits which lifted his soul above, he permitted his servants a licence in the management of his house and affairs which he confesses was little short of criminal. They actually were seen to thrust their hands into his coffers and abstract what gold they wanted, unchecked by him.

Brandes complains "In all the obscurity of Shakespeare's life-story, nowhere do we feel our ignorance more acutely than here."

Nowhere do we trace more clearly the domestic and personal experience of the trustful philosopher whose servants not only robbed him of his wealth, but of what he valued most dearly of all, his honour.

His friends, whose adoption he had tried or thought he had, spurned him in his fall, and poor sycophants, late guests at his table, refused him the smallest courtesy when in his disgrace he sought it at their hands. The parallel is complete, no darker shadow eclipsed Timon than that which shrouded Francis' later days with gloom.

It is in his last pages that Brandes reaches the height of his absurdity with regard to the man who was born and died at Stratford, the town whose only value in the eyes of contemporary writers was that it possessed a bridge of fourteen arches.

He tells us that the boon companion of the retired actor Shaxburd was John a'Combe, Steward of Ambrose, Earl of Warwick, "a man of low repute as tax-collector and worse as money lender and usurer." This is bad enough, but there are comments that follow:

"Tradition tells us that the poet and Combe . . . spent much time together . . . in the tavern (now the Falcon), which lay just across the road. Here then, the mighty genius . . . sat tossing dice and emptying his glass . . . with a country bumpkin of doubtful reputation." It seems incredible that Brandes can seriously contemplate such a picture of the author of *Hamlet*.

"Tradition further states that it was one of Shakespeare's few amusements to compose ironical epitaphs for his acquaintances, and he is said to have written an exceedingly

contemptuous one on John a'Combe in his character of usurer and extortioner." This epitaph is proved to have been printed as early as 1608; John Combe died in 1614. Was it on Shaxpur's character of epitaph writer his reputation of poet was established in his native town, not too particular in its taste? With his champion Brandes we began our article, with his words we finish. They are full of suggestion, but hardly of the kind which he would have chosen to call forth.

"If he (John a'Combe) was the best of Shakespeare's Stratford associates, we can figure to ourselves the rest."

ALICIA AMY LEITH.

THE OWEN, GALLUP, CIPHER DISCOVERIES.

"The soul's dark cottage, battered and decayed,
Lets in new lights through chinks that time hath made."

THE second part of Mr. Harold Bayley's book consists of selections from recent Cipher discoveries made by Mrs. Gallup, and Doctor O. Owen. Anybody, acquainted with Bacon's style, and way of thinking, will recognize the striking character of these excerpts! Of course, the critics attribute this appositeness to the novelist's art, of introducing from Bacon's prose writings, whatever is characteristic of his style or mind, into the Cipher revelations. All I can say is, that if so, it has been *miraculously well done*, and must have entailed harder work than even the Cipher itself! For example, take this, cited by Mr. Harold. Bayley, from the Biliteral discoveries of Mrs. Gallup:—"*A man doth slowly eat his very inmost soul and heart, when there shall cease to be a friend to whom he may open his inner thought, knowledge or life.*" ("Biliteral," I., p. 109; "Tragedy of Sir Francis Bacon"). In his Essay upon *Friendship* Bacon says:—"The parable of *Pythagoras* is dark, but true; *Cor ne edito; Eat not the Heart.* Certainly if a man would give it a hard phrase, those that want friends *to open themselves unto, are cannibals of their own hearts.*" (*Essays. Friendship*).

The "Biliteral" continues:—"In truth a man's thorough opening, thus to a friend all that his brain conceiveth, or th' soul is conscious of, *will oft save his reason.* He will eat his heart in lonely musings, for oft a feav'rous fire burneth in him, as worlds visions shifting and looming with wondrous swiftness on th' view, wore the mind from its *labours to a rest-*

less toss as a ship is beaten by merciless winds, or like to egg shells crush'd together, broken to pieces, or soon made wrack." ("Biliteral," p. 17). Bacon writes :—"It is not to be forgotten, what *Commineus* observeth, of his first master *Duke Charles the Hardy;* namely, that he would communicate his secrets with none; and least of all, those secrets, which troubled him most. Whereupon he goeth on, and saith, 'that towards his latter time' '*that closeness did impair, and a little perish his understanding.*' Surely *Commineus* mought have made the same judgment also, if it had pleased him, of his second master, Lewis the Eleventh, *whose closeness was indeed his tormentour.*" (*Friendship. Essays*, 1625). Bacon was evidently suffering from the same disease of closeness, as these examples, he cites! And with regard to the labouring of his mind, upon the tempest tossed sea of his troubled thoughts, *from want of someone to communicate with*, is it not reflected in this passage from the same Essay? "The second fruit of friendship, *is healthful and soveraigne for the understanding*, as the first is for the affections. For friendship maketh indeed a fair day in the affections *from storm and tempests.* But it maketh daylight in the understanding, out of darkness and confusion of thoughts." (*Friendship. Essays*, 1625).

Compare this magnificent passage *from the word Cipher, which if an invention* stamps Doctor Owen, as the inspired fabulist of a sublime pen :—"*Strive as I may, it is only driven from my brain by th' unceasing tossing of this sea of labouring cogitations for the Advancement of Learning. Oft driven as twere with sudden wind or tide, its waves strike against the very vault of th' heavens, and break in useless wreaths of bubbling froth.*" ("Word Cipher," p. 46).

There is nothing in this passage that a Cipher novelist could possibly attain to, so lofty is the language, so profound the imagery! If the student will turn to Bacon's "*Cogitata et Visa de Interpretatione Naturæ*," he will find every paragraph commencing with the repeated words :—"*Franciscus Baconus sic cogitavit*" *etc.*—so that he will perceive how thoroughly Baconian is this word "*cogitations.*" It is an actual fact, that Bacon likened his *Advancement of Learning* (and *De Augmentis Scientiarum of* 1623) to a ship, crossing the ocean of time, in order to discover, and open out, his NEW WORLD OF DEFICIENTS, or the invisible and spiritual, concealed by his interpretative frame, or plan embraced in the Instauratio. The very port and haven of his rest was this end, so beauti-

fully hinted at in the final book of the *De Augmentis*. And for the strange metaphor of a *tempest toss'd brain*, does not Lear exclaim :—

> *Lear.*—The tempest in my mind
> Doth from my senses take all feeling else
> Save what beats there.—Act III. iv.
>
> * * * * *
>
> *Kent.*—Where's the King?
> *Gent.*—Contending with the fretful element;
> Bids the wind blow the earth into the sea
> *Or swell the curled waters above the main.*—Act III. i.

If Doctor Owen made use of this, for his purposes of word Cipher fable, I must repeat, *it is exceedingly well done!* To penetrate the brain of poets, so as to reproduce their profundities of thought and style, and moreover to clothe the imitation in poet's language, is a feat nearly allied to creation itself! Observe the same imagery is introduced in the *Merchant of Venice*.

> Your mind is *tossing* on the ocean;
> There, where your argosies with portly sail,
> Like seigniors and rich burghers on the flood,
> Or, as it were, the pageants of the sea
> Do overpeer the petty traffickers.
> —*Merchant of Venice*, Act I. i.

In direct context with the passage already cited, from the *Essay of Friendship*, upon the fruit thereof (*i.e.*, that "it maketh a fair day in the affections from *Storm and Tempests*") is the following expression, in keeping with the passage given by Dr. Owen: — "*He tosseth his thoughts more easily;* he marshalleth them more orderly." (1625).

Coleridge speaks of what he calls the *Oceanic mind* of the Author of these Plays, who he imagined was Shakespeare. It is an excellent image every way, for the vastness of this mind has set a barrier to its own discovery or crossing, thinkers of all descriptions and capacities, having set out in vain upon voyages of discovery, never imagining how useless such efforts were, unless they embarked in Bacon's saucy bark, on the enterprise of mapping out his intellectual Globe, or New world (with its deficiencies of sciences,) as a key book of discovery for the Plays.

> Let this sad interim like the ocean be
> Which parts the shore * where two contracted new

* In double connection with dreams of sovereignty, and sundering seas of time, and distance, the following passage appears important:—

Duke of Gloucester.—Why, then, I do but dream of sovereignty;

> **Come daily to the banks, that when they see**
> **Return of love, more blest may be the view.—Sonnets 56**

Bacon frequently uses the words *froth, frothy,* to denote vain efforts, or vain dreams, fruitless of effect. The same image of striking against the vault of heaven, in close connotation with froth, is to be found in the description of the tempest tossed ship which carries the babe Perdita, and casts her ashore to the care of the Shepheards.

> *Clown.*—O, the most piteous cry of the poor souls! Sometimes to see 'em, and not to see 'em, and now the ship *boring the moon with her mainmast, and anon swallowed with yest and froth, as you'd thrust a cork into a hogshead.—Winter's Tale,* Act II. iii.

Bacon's *affection towards learning,* is eloquently set forth in the Two Books of the *Advancement* (as well as in the *De Augmentis*), and is apologised for in the first Book. These two works are each compared to a ship. "So that, if the invention of the ship was thought so noble, which carrieth riches and commodities from place to place, and consociateth the most remote regions in participation of their fruits, *how much more are letters to be compared to be magnified, which as ships pass through the vast seas of time, and make ages so distant to participate of the wisdom, illuminations, and inventions, the one of the other.*" (Two Books of *Advancement of Learning,* chap. i., Book II.).

This affection for learning had another incentive—its real object was to provide proof and interpretation for the Plays —to hand down to posterity a Keybook, that should open up the boundless stores of an undiscovered country. And hence the affection becomes a wind, an agitating force, exactly as we refind it in the Plays,—a pain because of obstacles of time and difficulty.

> **Throw up thine eye! See, see, what showers arise,**
> **Blown with the windy tempest of my heart.**
> —3 *K. Hen. VI.,* Act II. v.

It is highly important to show, that the metaphor of the

> **Like one that stands upon a promontory,**
> **And spies a far-off shore where he would tread,**
> **Wishing his foot were equal with his eye,**
> ***And chides the sea that sunders him from thence,***
> **Saying, he'll lade it dry to have his way,**
> ***So do I wish the crown being so far off.***
> —3 *K. Hen. VI.,* Act III. ii.

Bacon's case was very like this, whether we consider this crown in the light of his poetical authorship, or as a birthright in the other sense,— or as both?

ship device, as applied to the Two Books of the *Advancement of Learning* (and their re-writing, or augmentation of 1623, entitled, *De Augmentis*), was no passing simile but a settled, constant, and profound image repeatedly hinted at. For example, in conclusion of his last and Ninth Book of the *De Augmentis*, Bacon writes:—"And now we have *with a small bark*, such as we were able to set out, *sailed about the universal circumference, as well of the old, as of the New World of Science, with how prosperous winds and course, we leave to posterity to judge.*" (Book IX. p. 467, *Adv. of Learning*, 1640.)

This same image appears in the Sonnets:—

> But since your worth, wide as the Ocean is,
> The humble as the proudest sail doth bear,
> My saucy *bark* inferior far to his
> On your broad main doth wilfully appear.
>
> —Sonnets 80.

In another passage Bacon writes:—"The *gardens of the Muses* keep the privilege of the golden age; they even flourish and are in league with Time. The monuments of wit survive the monuments of power; *the verses of a poet endure without a syllable lost, while States and Empires pass many periods.* Let him not think he shall descend, for he is now upon a hill *as a ship mounted on the ridge of a wave.*"

In commenting upon the conspiracy of Lambert Simnel (who first counterfeited the second son of Edward the Fourth, supposed to be murdered in the Tower; and afterwards Edward Plantagenet, then prisoner in the Tower), Bacon writes: "*For this lad was not to personate one that had long before been taken out of his cradle, or conveyed away in his infancy known to few*, but a youth that till almost the age of ten years had been brought up in a Court where infinite eyes had been upon him." ("History of King Henry VII.," p. 21, 1622.) According to Mrs. Gallup's bi-literal Cipher discoveries, Bacon *had been conveyed away secretly in his cradle*, in exactly the sense described in the above passage. I think it is evident, Bacon in penning this sentence, had some such instance, or case before him, in his "mind's eye," else why does he introduce it? If the Cipher story is true, it is certain all cases of this sort, *i.e.*, pretenders, and claimants to the throne, would exercise extraordinary fascination for Francis St. Alban. It is therefore to be noted, he further adds of Simnel:—"But yet doubting that there would be too near looking, and too much perspective into his disguise, if he should show it in England, he thought good

(*after the manner, of Stage Plays and Masques*) to show it afar off." ("History of King Henry VII.," p. 23.) Bacon tells us, in his *Advancement of Learning*, that he has employed a style, in writing, that he calls PERSPECTIVE, *by which one part is intended to illuminate another.* In fact, Simnel was alarmed, lest there should be too much inquiry, or putting of two and two together, as to his imposture, *i.e.*, "*too much perspective into his disguise.*"

One of Bacon's Essays is entitled, *Of Masques and Triumphs.* It is highly important to insist upon the point, *that the Masque was a Stage Play in which the actors concealed their faces.* Striking evidence of this fact is extant. In January, 1617, Bacon dined at Gray's Inn, to give countenance to their Lord and Prince, of Purpoole, and to see their revels. On this occasion a piece of Ben Jonson's, called "*Prince's Masque,*" was performed. Nathaniel Brent, commenting upon the performance, says, "The poet is grown dull, that his device is thought not worth the relating, much less the copying out. Divers think fit he should return to his old trade of bricklaying again." Chamberlain adds, "*I cannot call it a masque, seeing they were not disguised nor had vizards.*" (Chamberlain to Carleton, Feb. 7, 1617-1618. See p. 149; Mrs. Pott's "Francis Bacon and his Secret Society.")

It is exactly in this sense Bacon alludes to Lambert Simnel's imposture or disguise, *i.e.*, as an actor or man with a masque on! But I think Bacon is thinking of a particular case, or parallel (presented in Stage Plays or Masques)—viz., to the impostor Jack Cade, who makes the following false claim of descent:—

Staf.—Villain, thy father was a plasterer;
And thou thyself a shearman, art thou not?
Cade.—And Adam was a gardener.
Bro.—And what of that?
Cade.—Marry this: Edmund Mortimer, Earl of March,
Married the Duke of Clarence's daughter, did he not?
Staf.—Ay, Sir.
Cade.—By her he had two children at one birth.
Bro.—That's false.
Cade.—Ay, there's the question; but I say 'tis true:
The elder of them, being put to nurse,
Was by a beggar woman stolen away;
And ignorant of his birth and parentage,
Became a bricklayer when he came to age:
His son I am; deny it if you can.

2 *K. Hen. VI.* Act IV. ii.

Another passage from the bi-literal Cipher discovery, quoted by Mr. Bayley, runs:—"*In this work o' my hands, I am heir*

apparent to a much loftier seat, a sceptre of power, that must even extend to posterity. No time, nor death, can take my second kingdom from me." (*Ibid*, p. 190.)

There is a very strong echo to this in the Sonnets :—

> Thus have I had thee, *as a dream doth flatter,*
> *In sleep a king, but waking no such matter*—Sonnets 87.
>
> * * * * *
>
> 'Gainst death and all oblivious enmity
> Shall you pace forth; your praise shall still find room
> Even in the eyes of all posterity. Sonnets 55.

The same consciousness of the *royal or kingly mind* refinds itself expressed in the Sonnets :—

> Or whether doth my mind, being *crown'd* with you,
> Drink up the *monarch's* plague this flattery?
>
> * * * * *
>
> O, 'tis the first, 'tis flattery in my seeing
> *And my great mind most kingly drinks it up.*
>
> —Sonnet 114.

Compare the bi-literal Cipher :—"It is no improper exaltation of self when one feeling in heart and brain *the Divine gifts that fit him for his princely destiny*,—or that rightly inherited, albeit wrongly withholden sovereignty,—*in true noble kingly spirit doth look for power*, not for the sake of exercising that gift, but that he may uplift his people from the depth of misery into which they constantly sink, etc." ("Bi-literal," p. 46.) In a prefatory poem prefixed to the first folio Plays, 1623, are the following lines by Hugh Holland :—

> Dry'd is that vein, dry'd is the Thespian spring,
> Turn'd all to tears and Phœbus clouds his rays :
> That corps, that coffin now bestick those bayes,
> *Which crown'd him poet first, then poets King.*

These metaphors may possibly be pertinent to poetical powers alone, but we are bound to admit the benefit of the doubt, whether something else does not lie hid behind them? Ben Jonson celebrates Bacon's birthday, 1620, by a poem in which are these lines :—

> Give me a deep bowl'd *crown*, that I may sing
> *In raising him the wisdom of my King.*

In a description of the character of Queen Elizabeth, the Biliteral Cipher says, "She commonly restrained the course and proceedings of her ministers, and servants, *for fear they would overtop and overshadow her*" (p. 94). This word "*overtop*" is thoroughly Baconian, and out of use in modern times.

In the Essay upon *Ambition*, Bacon says :—"There is use also of ambitious men, in pulling down the greatness of any subjects that *overtops:* as *Tiberius* used *Macro* in the pulling down of *Sejanus.*" (*Essays*, 1625).—Prospero, describing Miranda's false uncle, who supplanted him in the Dukedom of Milan, exclaims :—

Prosp.—Being once perfected how to grant suits,
How to deny them; who to advance, and who
To trash for overtopping.—The Tempest, Act I. ii.

This expression of *overtopping* is entirely an agricultural metaphor, borrowed from the garden.—

Gard.—Go thou, and like an executioner
Cut off the heads of too fast growing sprays,
That look too lofty in our commonwealth.
—*K. Rich. II.*, Act III., iv.

Bacon observes: "Periander being consulted with how to preserve a tyranny newly usurped, bid the messenger attend and report what he saw him do; and went into his garden and topped all the highest flowers: signifying that it consisted in the cutting off and keeping low of the nobility and grandees." (2 Book of *Advt. of Learning*, p. 164).

Richard the Third, in just this fashion, cut off those young princes, *whose overtopping heads stood in the way of his ambition.*

Richard III.—And will she yet abase her eyes on me,
That cropp'd the golden prime of this sweet prince,*
And made her widow to a woeful bed?
—*K. Rich. III.*, Act I. ii.

So Pericles, escaping the fury of the tyrant Antiochus, exclaims

Pericles.—Then, lest my life be *cropp'd* to keep you clear,
By flight I'll shun the danger which I fear.
—*Pericles*, Act I. i.

Bacon writes: "Pindar when he would extol† Hiero speaks

* Compare Richard's *waking dream* of succession to the crown :—
That from his loins no hopeful branch may spring
To cross me from the *golden time* I look for.
—3 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act III. ii.

In his *Advancement of Learning*, Bacon writes: "A matter revealed and prefigur'd unto Domitian, in a dream, the night before he was slain, for he seemed to see grow behind upon his shoulders *a neck and a head of gold*, which Divination came indeed accordingly to pass, in those *golden times* which succeeded." (Chap. VII., Book I., *Advt. of Learning.*)

† "*The cropping off the tops, or summities of all worthies,*" may be understood, in the sense of a patron of learning gathering about him men of genius, as flowers are collected into posies; or it may have been the opposite sense of banishment, death, or cutting off. Bacon, as usual, is guarded in his language.

(as usually he doth) most elegantly *that he cropp'd off the tops, or summities of all virtues.*" (*Advt. of Learning*, Liber IV., p. 179, 1640). The hint given is very pointed. Hiero was a tyrant of Syracuse, and was a patron of literature. The poets Æschylus, Pindar, Simonides, took up their residence at his court. And Bacon is also indicating the power and danger of envy felt towards poets in all ages, and which finds its reflection in the Sonnets, particularly in that pathetic Sonnet, where the poet sums up his times.

> **And art made tongue-tied by authority.—Sonnets 66.**

Dionysus, another tyrant of Sicily, banished Plato and Philoxenus, the poet, because they excelled his glory and eclipsed it as he thought. And Horace writes of envy :—

> **Siculi non invenere tyranni**
> **Majus tormentum.**

From a similar cause—the fear of a tyrant's envy—we find Pericles fleeing the court of Antiochus :—

> *Pericles.*—**I knew him tyrannous; and tyrants' fears**
> **Decrease not, but grow faster than the years.**
> **—*Pericles*, Act I., ii.**

Observe that this constitute one of Bacon's "*New World of Sciences*" entitled, "SUMMITIES," and very likely the subject embraces an apology for the cryptic character of his art? That is to say, that envy constitutes a danger to the poet who dares venture to speak truth in any age, and can be escaped, either by flight, *or by disguise and concealment.* In the same language, (of the murder of Prince Edward), Queen Margaret exclaims :—

> **Butchers and villains! bloody cannibals!**
> ***How sweet a plant have you untimely cropp'd!***
> **—Third Part *K. Hen. VI.*, Act V. v.**

The entire title of this deficient of Bacon's *New World of Sciences*, is, TRIUMPHI HOMINIS, *or of the Summities and highest pitch of human Nature.* (Liber IV., *Advt. of Learning*, 1640.) It is the sixteenth of the Deficients, in order, (as they are catalogued at the end of the work), and its subject matter evidently deals with genius, or with extraordinary examples of human perfection, that either as poets, or philosophers, or men of virtue have excited the admiration or envy of tyrants! Socrates and Seneca (the former exciting the envy of the Thirty Tyrants, the latter of Nero) are examples! Bacon observes that the Emperor Adrian mortally envied artists and poets (*Advt. of Learning*). And the length of Bacon's Essay upon

Envy, proves how he had observed and pondered over this subject. James the First was an author, and a poet, and perhaps as "*a concealed poet*," Bacon found it expedient not to openly compete with the Royal Master whose favour he was soliciting?

Another passage of the "Biliteral" cited by Mr. Bayley runs :—

"It shall be seen that to my mind the discypherer "*is th' modest co'fessor who listeneth behind a lattice to what I do impart*" (p. 153).

This literary trifle, or simile of a "*lattice*," is out of the ken of a fraudulent discipherer. It is a Baconian image and word, also to be re-found in the plays, introduced in the same sense. For example, *Parolles*,—whose name means *words*,—*has his character disciphered by one called* LAFEU :—

> *Lafeu.*—Do not plunge thyself too far in anger, lest thou hasten thy trial; which if—Lord have mercy on thee for a hen! *So, my good window of lattice*, fare thee well; *thy casement I need not open, for I look through thee.—All's Well that Ends Well*, Act II. iii.

Lattice is used here in the sense of woodwork, probably a sort of cross framing in which the old-fashioned diamond-shaped panes of glass were set, in Bacon's time? Through this the light passed through in a sort of *Chiaroscuro*. The same can be said of words (Parolles) as Tennyson exclaims :—

> For words like nature *half conceal*
> *And half reveal* the soul within.

In his Essay of *Simulation and Dissimulation*: "There be three degrees, of *this hiding, and veiling of a man's self*. The first *Closeness*, *Reservation*, and *Secrecy*. For the first of these, *Secrecy*: It is indeed *the virtue of a confessor*; and assuredly, *the secret man, heareth many confessions*; for who would open himself to a blab or blabber?" * (*Essays*, 1625.)

"These properties of *Art* or *Policy*, and *Dissimulation or Closeness*, are indeed habits and faculties several, and to be distinguished. For if a man have that penetration of judgment, as he can discern, what things are to be laid open, and

* *Parolles.*—I love not many *words*. [*Exit.*]
Sec. Lord.—*No more than a fish loves water.—All's Well*, Act III., vi.

* * * * *

> *Lafeu.*—Go to, sir; you were beaten in Italy for *picking a kernel out of a pomegranate.*—Act II. iii.

In Bacon's Essay of *Friendship* is this:—"And these two noble *fruits* of friendship; (*Peace in the affections*, and *support of the judgment*) followeth the last fruit; which is like the *Pomegranate, full of many kernels*; I mean *aid*, and *bearing a part*, in all *actions* and *occasions*." (1625.)

what is to be secreted, *and what to be showed at half-lights*, and to whom, and when (which indeed are Arts of state, and Arts of Life, as Tacitus well calleth them) to him, a habit of Dissimulation is a hinderance and a poorness." (*Essays*, 1625.)

Observe that this Essay may be called, an Essay upon *Concealment* (*or Closeness*), and that it embraces, or understands everything within the category of the cryptic, and acroamatic, besides being a finger post for characters like Richard the Third, *and, indeed, for all Actors on or off the stage of life.*

A lattice seems to answer to Bacon's "*half-lights*"—that is to say, half concealment and half revelation, as in a room where the sun enters through Venetian lattice work, or sun-blinds :—

> **Revealing day through every cranny *spies*.**
> **—*Lucrece*, Northumberland MSS., 1086.**

This *casement, or lattice of words* (Parolles) probably is identical with the *windows of the heart, or breast*, of Sonnet 24 :—

> **For through the painter must you see his skill,**
> **To find where your true image pictur'd lies;**
> **Which in my bosom's shop is hanging still,**
> **That hath his *windows* glazed with thine eyes**
> **Now see what good turns eyes for eyes have done:**
> **Mine eyes have drawn thy shape, and thine for me**
> ***Are windows to my breast*, where through the sun**
> **Delights to peep to gaze therein on thee.**

In "Observations upon a Libel," Bacon alluding to Queen Elizabeth, makes the remark :—"Contrariwise, her Majesty not taking *to make windows into men's secret thoughts.*" (Page 127, *Resuscitatio*, 1662.) In the *Advancement of Learning* Bacon describes the idea of Momus, which was to make a *window in every man's breast in order to discover his window, or his heart* :—"That window which Momus did require: who seeing in the frame of man's heart such angles and recesses, found fault *that there was not a window to look into them.*" (Two Books of *Advt. of Learning.*) Pistol's obscure epithets are called, by Falstaff, "*red lattice phrases.*" (*Merry Wives*, Act II.) And in this point it is plain Parolles is classed with the former.

These parallels might greatly be multiplied if space permitted. But enough has been adduced to prove that the Cipher discoveries reveal an amazing congruity of thought and style with the acknowledged work of Francis, St. Alban.

W. F. C. WIGSTON.

POEMS HITHERTO PUBLISHED ANONYMOUSLY, OR UNDER THE NAMES OF SEVERAL DIFFERENT PERSONS; AND FROM INTERNAL EVIDENCE BELIEVED TO BE THE PRODUCTION OF FRANCIS "BACON."

The Shepherd's Description of Love.

(*Before* 1600.)

Melibœus.—Shepherd, what's love? I pray thee tell.

Fau.—It is that fountain and that well
Where pleasure and repentance dwell;
It is perhaps that sauncing bell
That tolls all into heaven or hell: *
And this is love as I heard tell.

Meli.—Yet, what is love? I prithee say.
It is a work of holiday;
It is December matched with May; †
When lusty bloods, in fresh array,
Hear ten months after of the play:
And this is love as I hear say.

Meli.—Yet, what is love, good shepherd sain?

Fau.—It is sunshine mixed with rain; ‡
It is a toothache, or like pain;
It is a game where none doth gain;
The lass saith no, and would full fain:
And this is love, as I hear sain.

Meli.—Yet, shepherd, what is love, I pray?

Fau.—It is a yea, it is a nay—
A pretty kind of sporting fray; §
It is a thing will soon away;
Then, nymphs, take 'vantage ‖ while ye may:
And this is love, as I hear say.

Meli.—Yet, what is love, shepherd? Show!

Fau.—*A thing that creeps—it cannot go;* ¶
A prize that passeth to and fro;
A thing for one, a thing for moe;

* "It is a bell
That summons thee to heaven, or to hell."—*Macb.* ii. 1.

† "He speaks holiday, he smells April and May."—*Mer. Wiv.* iii. 2.

‡ "You have seen sunshine and rain at once."—*Lear* iv. 3.

§ "Their jangling I esteem a sport.
. . . These lovers seek a place to fight."—*M. N. D.* iii. 2.

‖ "To take advantage," frequent Baconian expression.

¶ "Love will creep in service where it dare not go" (*Two Gent Ver.* iv. 2). This saying, which seems to be compounded of two proverbs in "Heywood's Epigrams," reappears in a letter from Bacon to James I., which accompanied the sending of a portion of the "History of Great Britain:"—"This (history) being but a leaf or two, I pray your pardon if I send it for your recreation, considering that *love must creep where it cannot go.*"

And he that proves shall find it so ;
And, shepherd, this is love, I trow.

De Morte.

Man's life's a tragedy: his mother's womb,
From which he enters, is the tiring room ;
This spacious earth *the theatre*, * and *the stage*
That country which he lives in : passions, rage,
Folly and vice are actors ; the first cry,
The prologue to the ensuing tragedy : †
The former act consisteth of dumb shows ;
The second, he to whom perfection grows ;
T' the third he is a man. and doth begin
To nurture vice. and act the deeds of sin ;
T' the fourth declines ; t' the fifth, diseases clog
And trouble him ; then death's his epilogue. ‡

A Farewell to the Vanities of the World.

Farewell, ye gilded follies. pleasing troubles !
Farewell, ye honoured rags, ye glorious bubbles !
Fame's but a hollow echo ; gold, pure clay ;
Honour, the darling but of one short day ;
Beauty, the eye's idol, but a damasked skin ;
State, but a golden prison to live in
And torture free-born minds ; embroidered trains,
Merely but pageants for proud-swelling veins ;
And blood allied to greatness is alone
Inherited, not purchased, nor his own ;
Fame, honour, beauty, state, train, blood and birth
Are but the fading blossoms of the earth.
I would be great, but that the sun doth still
Level his rays against the rising hill ;
I would be high, but see the proudest oak
Most subject to the rending thunder stroke ;
I would be rich, but see men too unkind
Dig in the bowels of the richest mind :
I would be wise, but that I often see
The fox suspected while the ass goes free ;
I would be fair, but see the fair and proud
Like the bright sun oft selling in a cloud ;
I would be poor, but know the humble grass
Still trampled on by each unworthy ass ;
Rich, hated, wise, suspected, scorned of poor
Great feared ; fair, tempted ; high still envied more
I have wished all, but now I for neither

* Compare :—" This wide and universal theatre
Presents more pageants than the scene
Wherein we play in. All the world's a stage,
And all the men and women merely players." &c.
—See *As You Like It* ii. 7 (lines 136—166).

† "Prologue to the omen coming on."—*Ham.* i. 1.

‡ Compare :—*As You Like It* ii. 7 (lines 136—166).

Great, high, rich, wise, nor fair: poor I'll be rather.
Would the world now adopt me for her heir;
Would beauty's queen entitle me the fair;
Fame speak me fortunes minion; could I vie
Angels with India; with a sparkling eye
Command bared heads, bowed knees, strike justice dumb,
As well as blind and lame, or give a tongue
To stones by epitaphs; be called great master
In the loose rhymes of every poetaster;
Could I be more than any man that lives
Great, fair, rich, wise, all in superlatives;
Yet I more freely would these gifts resign
Than ever fortune would have made them mine
And hold one minute of this holy visure
Beyond the riches of this empty pleasure.
Welcome pure thoughts! welcome ye silent groves,
These guests, these courts, my soul most dearly loves;
Now the winged people of the sky shall sing
My cheerful anthems to the gladsome spring;
A Prayer-book now shall be my looking-glass
In which I will adore sweet virtue's face
Here dwell no hateful looks, no palace cares,
No broken vows dwell here nor pale-faced fears;
Then here I'll sit and sigh my hot love's folly,
And learn to affect an holy melancholy;
And if contentment be a stranger then
I'll ne'er look for it, but in heaven, again.

This poem created much curiosity and interest when, in 1889, Dr. Alexander Grosart announced the intended publication of his new "Literary find"—an original poem in MS. by Francis Bacon. The promised event, however, did not take place, a fact said to have been attributed by Dr. Grosart to his dread lest the crazy Baconians should use this poem as an argument in favour of their own doctrines. The poem meanwhile had been long before printed and published under various names. In Walton's "Complete Angler," edited by Nicolas, it was, in the first two Editions, attributed to Dr. Donne, and later, to Sir Henry Wotton. In the Ashmolean MSS. it is entitled, "Dr. Donn's Valediction to the World;" in "Wit's Interpreter," it is said to have been written by Sir Kenelm Digby. Sir H. Nicolas says that the verses are by Sir Walter Raleigh; Archbishop Sancroft publishes them anonymously with the title, "An Hermit in an Arbour Spurning a Globe." (*MS. Tanner*, 465, *fol.* 59.)

These particulars, which were collected many years ago have since been found, independently collated and neatly put together, in a Note to "The Courtly Poets,"* by Dr. Hannah,

* It is probable, from internal evidence, that almost every one of these "Courtly Poets" will prove to be a mask for Francis.

former Vicar of Brighton, and Prebendary of Chichester. The "Farewell" consists of 52 lines, of which 45 furnish upwards of 100 analogies to *Shakespeare*, besides *Promus* Notes, and other references to acknowledged works of *Bacon*. These Notes were edited and published in the "New Ireland Review," July, 1901 (Vol. XV., No. 5), by the Rev. William Sutton, S.J. We do not therefore reproduce them.

The following are some indubitable but seemingly little known lines, entitled :—

VERSES MADE BY MR. FRA. BACON. *

The man of life upright, whose guiltless heart is free
From all dishonest deeds, and thoughts of vanity;
That man whose silent days in harmless joys are spent,
Whom hopes cannot delude, nor fortune discontent;
That man needs neither armour, nor tower for defence,
Nor secret vaults to fly from thunder's violence.
He only can behold with unaffrighted eyes
The horrors of the deep and terrors of the skies.
Thus, scorning all the care that fate or fortune brings.
He makes the heaven his book, his wisdom heavenly things,
Good thoughts his only friends, his wealth a well-spent age;
The earth his sober inn,—a quiet pilgrimage.

—*Fra. Bacon.*

The more beautiful poem entitled, "The World,"† is more generally known, and begins—

"The world's a Bubble, and the life of man
Less than a span."

Space does not admit of more than the remark that, although in six instances this poem is signed, or *has been altered* to the name of the true author, yet there are as many different names attached to the various Editions, as we find with the other pieces which we ascribe to him. Thus, in the 1st Edition "The World" is signed *Ignoto*. In Farnaby's "Florilegium," 1629, p. 10, it is ascribed to *Lord Bacon*. In MS. Rawl., it is signed *R. W.* In the Ashm. MS., 38, the first title has "*by Dr. Donn*," altered to *Sir Fran. Bacon*. In Mr. Pickering's MS. copy the first signature, *Henry Harrington*, is altered to *Lord Verulam Viscount St. Albans*. The Edition in the *Reliquæ Wotton*, which Spedding reprints, is signed *Lord Bacon*.

Surely we need little more to convince us that Francis was the "Concealed Poet," who should yet one day "pace forth" and be truly known.

C. M. P.

* Spedding, "Works," vii. p. 269. † *Ib.*

TO THE EDITORS OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR SIRS,—In the "Memoirs of Queen Elizabeth," by Thomas Birch, D.D., we find mention made of a secret correspondence between Anthony Bacon and Sir Francis Walsingham, and the fact that in the Sydney Papers a certain Mr. Burnham is mentioned (1577), with whom both Sir Francis and the Queen express themselves extremely satisfied. It seems that by their orders he travelled to Picardy, Calais, Boulogne, Montreux, Abbeville and Amiens to see and hear what French forces were levied to enter the Low Countries. At his return he passed through Licques, where he had a conference with Mons. de la Motte, Governor of Graveling. A *secret journey* was made by him into the Low Countries before the Duke of Anjou made his first entry there. After this Mr. Burnham was despatched by the Secretary for State to Paris to Sir Amyas Paulet, and from thence to Rheims in Champagne, in order to see and learn what ill-affected subjects of her Majesty were there. He conferred with Dr. Alan and the English averse to the religion and government of their own country. From thence he went to the camp of Don John of Austria, who was besieging Limburg, and continued in it fifteen days, concealing himself under the protection of John Baptista de Monty, pretending to be a gentleman of his Court, cornet of horse to an Italian gentleman of Paris. After he had observed the state of the camp, and the enemies garrison and the towns through which he passed, he carried the relation which he had drawn up to the Lord Cobham, and Secretary Walsingham at Antwerp.

1st October, 1578, Mr. Burnham was sent by the Secretary to the camp of the Prince of Parma, the successor of Don John. On his return he drew up a relation, which was approved by the Queen and Secretary. In 1580 Mr. Burnham was despatched by the Secretary into Portugal to see what state that country was in. He stayed twenty-two days in Lisbon, disguised as a servant to a factor of Mr. Bird, merchant. He was three months exposed to constant danger, and strictly examined at several places. Mendoza had received some intimation of his voyage to Portugal, and sent over a description of his stature, countenance, and particular marks to know him by. He had embarked but twelve hours on his return to England before orders arrived from the Court of Spain to apprehend him. For these services, as well as for the several journeys in which he had been employed by the Secretary to the Duke of Anjou, and to William, Prince of Orange, and the States of the Low Countries, he requested some extraordinary gratification. A paper among Mr. Anthony Bacon's papers has the following :—

"A note of special services performed by Edward Burnham for her Majesty at the command and approval of the Right Hon. Sir F. Walsingham.

"Curiosity and attention to public affairs, highly acceptable to Secretary of State ; secrecy of the management of his intelligence—domestic and foreign—prevented posterity being acquainted with details of it."

Was Edward Burnham, Francis ? The year in which Burnham commenced his diplomatic missions was the same in which Francis went, under Paulet's wing, to France. We know he was engaged in some secret mission for the Queen, which she expressed herself well satisfied with. Anthony did not commence his foreign travels, we are expressly told, till

the year 1579, when he went to Paris. We also know that he had no interview with the Queen when he returned home because of his ill-health. If Francis was Edward Burnham—and there seems no reason why he should not have been, and every reason why he should,—he would have been an eye-witness of foreign camps and cities. With his knowledge of Italian, which he, no doubt, as Mr. Bompas points out, received from his mother Lady Bacon, he would have been useful in Parma, and this journey would give him ample opportunity for visiting Venice, and securing what we know he had, local colouring and definite impressions, almost impossible to acquire at second-hand.

The subject is well worth further investigation. The secrecy of the mission would have aided him considerably in the concealment of the authorship of the Plays; only a select few would have known that he visited Italy at all. It also explains, in a measure, his movements after leaving Cambridge being omitted from the *Athenae Cantabrigienses*.

Yours truly,

ALICIA AMY LEITH.

TO THE EDITORS OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR SIRS,—A recent work, Professor Engel's "History of English Literature," contains, not only much abuse of "Baconians," but also no small amount of censure upon Bacon himself.

Those who are hostile to the theories which inspire the periodical called BACONIANA, have in a vast number of cases fortified their arguments by depreciating the character and even the intellect of James the First's great Chancellor. In our opinion, such a proceeding is unfortunate. However displeased a disputant may be at the startling hints given from time to time as to the real authorship of the "Shakespeare Plays," it might have been prudent if the writers in favour of the "man" of Stratford-upon-Avon—and several of these writers are eminent in literature—*had welcomed a controversy which obliges the student to study both the plays and poems of W. S. and the great prose marvels which are attributed, without dispute, to Francis Bacon, Lord Verulam, Viscount St. Albans.*

Scoffs at Bacon himself, however, seem to be thought the most effective weapons—fortified by the everlastingly quoted disparagement of the immortal Francis, fulminated by Pope and Macaulay.

A foreign Professor may be, of course, allowed some latitude. We here, however, after quoting the Professor's grand peroration, think we can parry curiously his deadly thrust. Professor Engel thus concludes his diatribe :—

"And though the entire world's literary lunatic asylums should rise up and play their mad pranks in William Shakespear's name, Herder's words will hold good in time to come just as they have done for the last 250 years." (Here follows Herder):

"If there is one man *who calls up for me that grand image seated upon the lofty summit of a rock: Beneath his feet, storm, tempest and the raging of the sea*; *but his head in the radiance of heaven*, that man is Shakespeare. One must needs add though, how at the very base of his rocky throne are crowds that mutter, explain, curse, excuse, revile, translate, blaspheme—and none of them does he hear."

Had the Professor turned to the works of Bacon, he would have found something still more suitable to his purpose—namely Bacon's own allusion to poetic glory :—

"The monuments of Wit survive the monuments of Power. The verses of a poet endure without a syllable lost, while States and Empires pass many periods. Let him" (the poet) "not think he shall *descend : for he is now upon a hill as a ship is mounted upon the ridge of a wave : but that* HILL OF THE MUSES *is above tempests, always clear and calm ; a hill of the goodliest discovery, that man can have, being a prospect upon all the errors and wanderings of the present and former times. Yea, in some cliff it leadeth the eye beyond the horizon of time, and giveth no obscure divination of time to come.*"

Truly sublime words, eclipsing the quotation from Herder (if Herder indeed was not a copyist.) We have put in italics the portions of both passages which have more complete resemblance.

Bacon, though writing prose, can scarcely here be justly described as a "concealed" poet. Should not the anti-Baconians have the grace to admit that at least Francis Bacon was a great *Prose*-Poet ?

Yours faithfully,

GEORGE COLOMB (Colonel).

Junior United Service Club, S.W.

TO THE EDITORS OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR SIRS,—I should be much obliged to anyone who would kindly refer me to an authority (with edition and page) for the dash in "Enclo—Ased" as having been in the original inscription on Shakspere's tombstone. In Mr. Donnelly's book, ch. iv., p. 23, he says Malone gives the dash, and on p. 20 he apparently quotes Knight for it; but I have been unable to find the dash in any of the authorities, though I have searched in several editions. Although more than once in that chapter Mr. Donnelly gives the wrong authority for a particular variation from the present inscription, I have found that some authority or other supports him on each point except that of this dash, which is, as he says, "an important detail."

G. B. ROSHER.

35, Sheffield-terrace, W.

TO THE EDITORS OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—In the October issue of BACONIANA I made enquiry respecting Essex's skull, kindly replied to in April. The passage I had lost I have now found. It comes with singular interest to our notice at this time. It will be noted that the nearest relative of an executed person was the usual possessor of the head if it was preserved.

"William Shakespeare," by George Brandes, p. 311, Vol. II. :—"It is certain, . . . for the Duc de Biron, the Envoy of Henri IV., had no motive for telling a falsehood, that on the 12th Sep., 1601, after a conversation about Essex, in which she jested over her departed favourite, Elizabeth opened a box and took out of it Essex's skull, which she showed to Biron."

Yours truly,

A. A. L.